



# ILO EVALUATION

**Evaluation Title:** Decent jobs for youth and improved food security through the development of sustainable rural enterprises (YAPASA)

**ILO TC/SYMBOL:** ZAM/13/04/SID

**Type of Evaluation:** Independent Mid-term Evaluation

**Country (ies):** Zambia

**Date of the evaluation:** September – December 2016

**Name of consultant(s):** Ben Haagsma (Team Leader), Sadruddin Imran, Ivan Stubbs

**ILO Administrative Office:** CO-Lusaka

**ILO Technical Backstopping Office:** EMP/ENTERPRISES

**Donor (country and budget):** SIDA, US\$ 6,988,695

**For Joint Evaluations: Lead Organization:** ILO

**Participating organizations:** FAO

**Evaluation Manager:** Gugsa Yimer Farice, Abidjan, ILO Regional Office for Africa

**Key Words:** value chains, soya bean, aquaculture, food security, youth employment

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO's evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited, but has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Office.

**Independent Mid-term Evaluation Report on  
Decent jobs for youth and improved food security through the development  
of sustainable rural enterprises (YAPASA)**

**Project Code: ZAM/13/04M/SID**

**(Jointly Programme implemented by ILO and FAO)**

**For**

**International Labour Organization in Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia**

**By**

**Sadruddin Imran**

**Ivan Stubbs**

**Ben Haagsma**

**Zambia, November 2016**

(The Project is funded by the Swedish International Development Assistance through the Embassy of Sweden with a total budget of US\$ 6,988,695. The cost of evaluation was US\$ 30,000,-. The views expressed in the independent evaluation are the opinion of the evaluators and do not necessarily match with the views of the UN, ILO, FAO or SIDA)

## Table of Contents

List of tables and pictures .....	4
Acronyms .....	5
Executive Summary.....	6
1. Background of the Project .....	10
2. Evaluation Background .....	12
3. Methodology of the Evaluation .....	14
4. Findings .....	16
4.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit of the Program .....	16
4.2 Validity of M4P Approach, Design and Strategies Adopted by the Program.....	21
4.3 Project Progress and Delivery of Results .....	24
4.4 Efficiency of Resource Use .....	31
4.5 Organizational Management Arrangements .....	31
4.6 Impact Orientation and Sustainability .....	34
5. Conclusions .....	37
6. Lessons Learnt and Emerging Good Practices .....	38
7. Recommendations.....	39
Annex 1: Terms of reference .....	42
Annex 2: Inception Report .....	58
Annex 3: List of Persons Interviewed.....	61
Annex 4: Data Collection Instruments .....	63

## List of tables and pictures

Table 1: Relevance of Policy of Different Government Agencies with YAPASA

Table 2: List of Smallholder Value Chain Projects in Zambia

Table 3: Soybean Quantities Purchased with Processing Capacity 2016

Table 4: Partners and Beneficiary Data of YAPASA Up to 2016

Table 5: Current and projected future outreach by partner companies

Picture 1: Young farmers in Aquaculture Sector participating in an FGD

Picture 2: FGD participants in the Soybean sector

Picture 3: Onion is grown using the same farmers who were trained for Soybean

## Acronyms

ADAZ- Aquaculture Development Association of Zambia

CEEC – Citizen’s Economic Empowerment Council

CF – Conservation Farming

CTA – Chief Technical Officer

DCED – Donor Committee for Enterprise Development

DWCP - Decent Work Country Programme

FAO – Food and Agriculture Organization

FGD – Focus Group Discussion

ILO – International Labour Organization

KII – Key Informant Interview

M4P – Making Markets Work for the Poor

MRM – Monitoring and Results Measurement

NDP – National Development Plan

SC – Steering Committee

SIDA – Swedish International Development Agency

SSF – Small Scale Farmers

## Executive Summary

Under a UN Joint Programme implemented by the UN bodies of ILO and FAO, The Rural Youth Enterprise for Food Security RYE-FS initiative (branded as YAPASA) is aimed at addressing youth unemployment and food insecurity in rural communities, by facilitating attainment of sustainable livelihoods for young women and men in rural areas by the promotion of sustainable micro, small and medium-scale enterprises (MSMEs). While project stakeholders include government, non-government and private sector representatives, the main beneficiaries are young women and men living and working in rural districts of Zambia.

The two sub-sectors identified in the project are soy bean and aquaculture. While soy bean has been identified by NEPAD as a strategic crop for checking national food security issues, aquaculture provides sizable opportunity for poor farmers willing to get involved in it because of a national supply shortage. The geographical coverage of the project included the Northwest and Central parts of Zambia, with a project life of 4 years between October 2013 to August 2017- which includes a 1 year inception phase and 3 year implementation phase. The estimated budget for the project is USD 6.9 million, provided by SIDA, the government of Sweden. The project is jointly being implemented by ILO and FAO (local office and headquarters), with support from Government of Republic of Zambia (Ministry of Youth, Sport and Community Development, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries, Ministry of Commerce Trade and Industry), Zambia Federation of Employers, Zambia Congress of Trade Unions among many others.

The program utilizes the Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P) approach, playing a facilitative role to act on key systemic constraints, supporting existing market actors to innovate and act in the market so that all the parties involved will benefit from the market sustainably. Some of the private partners who have actively worked with the Program include MRI-Syngenta, Wind of Change, JEDO commodities, Palabana Fisheries, among others.

A team comprising Mr. Sadruddin Imran from Innovision Consulting as an international expert in M4P and project evaluation and Ivan Stubbs as national consultant carried out the Mid-term evaluation of the YAPASA program on the ground with support from Mr. Ben Haagsma, Fair& Sustainable Advisory Services, the Netherlands. The underlying goals of the Mid Term Evaluation were:

1. To independently assess the performance and progress to date of the project across all main components;
2. To provide strategic and operational recommendations as well as highlight lessons to improve performance and delivery of project results.

The scope of the evaluation was broad and strategic in nature, as it covered all aspects of the project, taking into consideration all project stakeholders. The assessment was qualitative in character, touching quantitative aspects as well as and where required. The consultants have triangulated responses from different sources in analysing and interpreting data, and coming up with conclusions and recommendations.

The consultants applied the DAC/OECD evaluation criteria as the basis for the assessment, with special emphasis on intended and unintended changes on the selected value chains.

The study was incepted with a desk review, where the consultants reviewed relevant project documents, used to develop interview tools and guidelines, and the sharing of an inception report. Then, in the field investigation phase, the consultants carried out Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). Interview respondents included ILO and FAO implementing staff; SIDA staff, government institutions, input supply companies, young soya and fish growers (men and women), buying companies; while FGDs were mainly carried out with young farmers. The main aim was to ensure thorough data collection encompassing all actors within the value chains of the soya and fish sub-sectors. Finally, a validation workshop or debrief session was held, where the consultants

presented the findings and recommendations to key ILO & FAO staff and the Project Steering Committee. Based on their review, the findings were updated, and final report prepared.

The YAPASA Project, in line of Zambia's revised Sixth National Development Plan, will help attain the Plan's objective of 'Promoting employment and job creation and rural development, through targeted and strategic investments in sectors such as science and technology, agriculture and energy development'. By attracting private sector partners to work with the youth, YAPASA will not only accelerate the process of job creation for the youths, but help ensure a larger population of the unemployed youth are involved in economic activities. The project activities are aligned with the mandate of Ministry of Commerce Trade and Industry, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, Ministry of Youth and Sport, Ministry of Labour and Social Security, Citizens' Economic Empowerment Commission with respect to their individual goals and objectives as outlined in their policies/strategies.

YAPASA is well aligned with the Sweden's development strategy for Zambia whose priorities includes contribution to 'Increased employment opportunities in rural and peri-urban areas and opportunities to start and run productive businesses', with ILO's focus on rural economic development, MSME development and social economy development and FAO's focus on reducing rural poverty while increasing decent employment opportunities for rural youth. The project also acts to support the targets set by the Decent Work Agenda for Africa (DWAA) by increasing investment, increasing access to credit, enhancing labour skills base, creating opportunity for youth, by creating enabling environment, improving transparency, women empowerment and ensuring adherence to UN good practices guidelines. YAPASA has also worked and are working in collaboration with similar SIDA funded projects like Musika, and FAO CASU program, among others.

While the programme is facilitating sustainable livelihoods attainment for young women and men in rural areas of Zambia through the promotion of sustainable micro-, small and medium-scale enterprises (MSMEs), and is meeting the target indicators, they will not meet the targets in the planned timeline, however, it will surpass the objectives upon programme completion. There are already some private companies engaged in the selected sectors, i.e. soya and aquaculture, and some of these private companies also have established inter-firm relationships prior to project intervention. The government of Zambia has also undertaken a facilitative approach, with facilities for access to finance from different ministries, and the Citizen's Economic Empowerment Council (CEEC), and even providing policy support to private sector actors. The markets for soya and cultivated fish are also growing in Zambia, with a good number of commercial farmers plying both the fields.

Both ILO and FAO have had the experience of working with private sector companies over a long period of time. Implementation of YAPASA gave both ILO and FAO practical experience of implementation of M4P project on the ground, learning from which can be taken to other country offices and in the respective headquarters for future program design, even by other development organizations and donor bodies.

The project team did not have a clear understanding of the market dynamics at the end of the inception period, especially because they were not engaged directly in the conduction of sector assessments. Hence, from the actual implementation phase in September 2014, the project team identified gaps between the logframe and real market situation. With internal discussions and brainstorming, the project decided to change its logframe by defining the outcomes and outputs differently. Some of the performance indicators also changed accordingly. The project objective was kept the same with the same performance indicators, but the means of verification changed to reflect the way Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED) monitoring system is applied. All these changes were made to reflect the realistic market situation that was somewhat missing in the logframe developed at the end of the inception phase.

In terms of gender balance, female participants are included in different types of interventions. Although the male to female ratio was not equal, a good number of females made up of the

beneficiary pool. The project was also able to maintain equality in the number of male and female project staffs.

The performance indicators against the outputs and outcomes are unlikely to be achieved by YAPASA within the project duration. While the expected outreach was 5,000 farmers, the report to the steering committee in June 2016 identified an outreach of only 1,960 farmers, although current estimates show a higher number. The main reason behind was the initial time invested behind better understanding of the market dynamics. This delay in understanding, together with a change in the leadership position got the project off-track although, must also be seen in the light that the M4P approach has, by nature, longer inception phases than other "direct implementation" approaches. But now armed with a deeper and sound market insight, appropriate partner base, the goal of sustainability will be ensured even after project phase out, and numbers reached upon completion of project.

In aquaculture not many development sectors are present, especially in the locations where YAPASA is operating. In that aspect, YAPASA can claim almost all the numbers in aquaculture on the ground. However in the case of policy for aquaculture, and with multiple development actors operating in soya bean, including Musika, SAPP, and CEEC, YAPASA needs to apply the attribution factor as per the DCED standards for results measurement to identify the actual project contribution.

In the first year of implementation, YAPASA was only able to work with partners that showed interest in working with the project and was not able to reach out to more prospective partners. Particularly, in the access to finance front, given the troubled macro-economic conditions of Zambia, they were not able to get on board financial institutions. As an alternative, MRI-Syngenta was approached for Soybean sector in providing input credit to the farmers through outgrowers. However, in the aquaculture sub-sector, the project had to invest money to demonstrate the success of the model of working with smallholder fish farmers. Although there were access to finance facilities in different government agencies, including in the Ministry of Youth and Sport and Department of Fisheries, the project was unaware of these resources. This, along with other gaps in delivery, can be attributed to the shortage of personnel in the project team. However, overall, all stakeholders involved in the project including government, non-government, and private sector partners and representatives carry a positive outlook about the project activities, outputs and outcomes.

YAPASA has made better progress in Soybean sector in the Northern Province. This is because, as the North is considered an investment hub, they have a pool of more willing private sector partners, a supportive local community, and the overall climate is conducive to the farming of the selected subsector. There were also a number of other development partners operational here, providing room for collaboration, and ultimately, the young farmers were very receptive of the project interventions, showing willingness to work with the project.

Given the right set of conditions, which are broadly generic, the project interventions are replicable in other projects in Zambia, in other sectors for a possible extension of YAPASA and even in other M4P projects in other countries. Some of the unintended positive benefits included cultivation of second cash crops among project beneficiaries, inclination towards creating environment-friendly products using crop residue among one of the private partners, and copying-in among parents of the young farmer beneficiary groups, especially in aquaculture.

Overall, the project had a conscious effort to ensure the quality of results ensuring optimum resource usage, although the quantity is unlikely to be achieved during the project lifespan as already mentioned before. But with the right design in place, the private partners are likely to go beyond the project target after the implementation period without additional project resources.

Although the initial bottlenecks arising from the absence of a dedicated MRM personnel and availability of only one car for field visit purposes were addressed, the lack of field level personnel,



which could be addressed by partner NGOs, and the frequent change in position of project personnel, in particular the CTA, hampered project activities.

The steering committee, which regularly met, and is comprised of representatives from the government and donors, regularly updated the SIDA on project activities through an established reporting framework, with a sound feedback mechanism from SIDA which helped the project in certain situations before. However, it is advised to have representatives of the private sector within the steering committee. There is also lack of coordination between the Project office and the FAO and ILO country offices and headquarters. The project staffs are trained on the DCED standards and a review of the progress of the project is conducted following the DCED standards regularly. It is difficult to see the problems and issues or lack of strategic alignment by the project staffs themselves in those review meeting, so it will be worthwhile to engage external DECED and/or M4P expert in those meetings at least twice a year. Also, the project is relying on the implementation partners for reporting of impact without direct or third party verification, which exposes YAPASA to potential false reporting.

The majority of the partners put great emphasis on building goodwill and trust relationships with the outgrower farmers, and do not treat them as mere suppliers. Farmers also understand the value of the relationship, the support from the outgrower companies in providing high-quality inputs, continuous technical knowledge, and ready market access. The management of the project is very supportive and flexible to revise the strategy to ensure that the project can absorb actual and potential shocks. The project team has an excellent relationship and very good communication with the private sector partners. The project actively looked at the environmental sustainability of all the interventions.

While YAPASA has completed more than half of its life, and has yet much to do, its success lies in the fact that it has developed a solid market understanding, and cemented strong partnerships across the value chain, which look to hold even after project phase out. However, certain aspects still require attention in terms of successful completion of the project and taking learning from it for the future:

- Improved line of formal communication with the country offices and headquarters.
- Improvement in documentation for better tracking of changes
- Improve the application of DCED standard, especially for attribution of impact
- Develop and disseminate communication materials to wider development community
- Improving the logframe to reflect the reality on the ground
- Ensuring adequate year-round income for the beneficiaries by supporting them in additionally available opportunities
- Exploring possibility of future joint program with other UN agencies by both ILO and FAO. It might be difficult to involve more than two agencies in one project, but ILO and FAO can explore this possibility separately.
- Seeking possibility of multi-donor funded project for future larger project funding

## 1. Background of the Project

The Rural Youth Enterprise for Food Security RYE-FS initiative (branded as YAPASA) is part of broader programmes of the International Labor Organisation (ILO) and Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) to promote decent work and food security in Zambia. The development challenge being addressed in Zambia through this UN Joint Programme is youth unemployment and food insecurity in rural communities. The programme facilitates attainment of sustainable livelihoods for young women and men in rural areas of Zambia through the promotion of sustainable micro, small and medium-scale enterprises (MSMEs). The initiative contributes to the broader effort of the Government of Zambia to implement the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP) of the African Union at national level; it furthermore responds to the call from the Rural Futures Initiative launched by the AU-New Economic Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) planning agency for alternative development models that “promote broad-based rural economic development and reduction of poverty and inequality including securing decent jobs and sustainable livelihoods”.

The direct recipients of the programme are selected national-level and sector-level governmental, non-governmental and private sector intermediary organizations with a mandate to promote sustainable business in the rural economy of Zambia. The ultimate programme beneficiaries are young women and men living and working in rural districts of the country.

The programme focuses on the two value chains of **soy beans and aquaculture**. Soy beans have been classified by NEPAD as a strategic crop for boosting national food security. The production and processing of soy beans already provides income to ninety one thousand (91,000) rural households in Zambia, with volumes set to increase on the back of fast growing regional and global demand. Similarly, aquaculture is a sector of strategic importance to Zambia, with the country facing pressure on capture fisheries resulting in an annual fish deficit of 100,000mt. Aquaculture is the most viable option for arresting this supply shortage. At present there are only 6,500 smallholder fish farmers contributing less than 15% of the 13,000mt of aquaculture fish. Both sectors are rural based and have scope to absorb youth at various levels in the value chain.

The two value chain analyses and market analyses undertaken in the Programme Inception Phase generated an informed understanding of how the two market systems functioned and identified key sector competitiveness factors and inter relationships with key market players and facilitators. The overall development objective of YAPASA is to facilitate the creation of decent jobs for youth and improved food security through the development of sustainable rural enterprises. Its key intervention logic and specific objectives are presented here:

<b>Key Log frame targets (impact performance)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3,000 decent jobs created for rural youth and 5,000 enterprises with improved performance</li> <li>• 10% increase in incomes for targeted rural youth</li> <li>• 20% increase in production yields from soybeans and aquaculture</li> </ul>
<b>Major components (outcomes)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved public perception and demand for soybean products and of rural economy as a source of youth employment (meta-level)</li> <li>• More enabling business environment for young entrepreneurs to start and formalize businesses in soybean and aquaculture value chains (macro-level)</li> <li>• More young people respond to economic opportunities in soybean and aquaculture market systems (micro-level)</li> <li>• Value chain development partners along the soybean and aquaculture value chains collaborate and coordinate effectively and efficiently (cross cutting)</li> </ul>

**Geographical coverage** of YAPASA were the North Western Province: Solwezi, Northern Province: Kasama, Luwingu and Mungwi; Central Province: Chibombo and Mumbwa; Lusaka Province: Chongwe; Southern Province: Chirundu. Programme duration was October 2013 – August 2017.

**Funding arrangement:** the Programme is funded by SIDA, the Government of Sweden with a total sum of USD 6.9 million, released in two parts for 1) 12 months inception phase and 2) 36 months implementation phase.

### **Project Management**

The programme is jointly implemented by ILO and FAO in consultation with the tripartite ILO constituents: Government of Republic of Zambia; employers (Zambia Federation of Employers) and workers (Zambia Congress of Trade Unions).

ILO HQ also acts as Administrator of the project funds. The project implementation team comprises staff from both ILO (5) and FAO (2) sitting within the ILO Lusaka offices under the leadership of an ILO Chief Technical Advisor CTA. The ILO Director is the principle staff responsible for programme implementation. The CTA supervises the staff, allocates programme budgets, prepares progress reports, maintains programme relations with institutional partners, elaborates the final programme document and develops work plans.

A Project Steering committee is established, chaired by the Ministry of Youth, Sport and Community Development with representation of other relevant government ministries (Agriculture; Livestock and Fisheries; Commerce Trade and Industry) and ILO Social partners and the heads of ILO and FAO.

The project is directly backstopped by the Decent Work Team (DWT), ILO Pretoria and in particular the Specialist on Job Creation and Enterprise Development, and at HQ level by the Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) unit of the Enterprise Department. The project also draws on technical expertise from the FAO HQ in Rome and the FAO Regional office in Harare. Given the newness of the M4P approach, further support by specialists trained on the techniques of the approach itself, is encouraged and should be strengthened.

### **Program approach and methodology of delivery**

The program follows the “Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P) approach”. The approach basically seeks to play a facilitative role to unlock the systemic constraints that are prohibiting the young poor’s participation in the market. By playing its facilitative role to act on key systemic constraints, YAPASA supports existing market actors to innovate and act in the market so that all the parties involved will benefit from the market sustainably. These actors might be the public and private agencies as well as the associations, research institutions and other representative bodies assuming a key role in the market.

In order to avoid market distortionary effect of traditional development programs YAPASA has partnered with private players in the market and has been working closely with key government agencies as a project collaborator. The project supports its ultimate beneficiaries, or rather active participants through the partner market players.

The YAPASA programme was set up to operate in two phases; first an inception phase (September 2013 – August 2014) to identify appropriate sector and subsectors for projected impact on youth employment, enterprise and food security followed by an experimental pilot and scale-up phase (September 2014 – August 2017) to test innovations in the selected market systems through small scale pilots followed by scale up to spread the innovation throughout the market system.

## 2. Evaluation Background

This chapter describes in a snapshot the evaluation background for this MTE. More details are found in Annex 1, which contains the detailed TOR. This MTE was an independent evaluation. All consultants did not have any prior involvement or connection with the YAPASA programme. Fair & Sustainable Advisory Services, the Netherlands, was contracted for this independent MTE of the YAPASA programme. The actual MTE was done by two consultants, identified, recruited and contracted by FSAS: 1) international consultant Sadruddin Imran, Innovision Consulting, Bangladesh and 2) national consultant Ivan Stubbs, Lusaka, Zambia. Throughout the entire evaluation FSAS rendered support to the 2 consultants, and coordinated the communication with the ILO Evaluation Manager, Gugsu Farice, based in Abidjan, Ivory Coast, and Steve Morris, CTA of ILO, based in Lusaka, Zambia.

The **purpose** of this MTE was twofold:

3. To independently assess the performance and progress to date of the project across all main components;
4. To provide strategic and operational recommendations as well as highlight lessons to improve performance and delivery of project results.

The **primary use** of the MTE was for **accountability and learning**. The recommendations will cover both the remaining period of the project as well as serve for the proposed next phase.

### Scope and character of evaluation

The scope of the evaluation was **broad**, as it covered all aspects of the project, including project theme, the wider context as well as operational and management dimensions. A key component of this scope was the quality of adherence to the systemic M4P approach. The scope was therefore also **strategic** as it looked for the appreciation of all stakeholders for this systemic market approach and its fit within wider sector programmes and the specific economic conditions in Zambia.

This mid-term evaluation had a rather **qualitative** character requiring the evaluators to make a critical analysis of the results achieved, progress made and other operational and management issues. To the extent possible the evaluators have looked for quantitative data for the purpose of proper illustration of qualitative answers. The evaluation has refrained from the use of a survey. The MTE has not looked for very detailed answers to the evaluation questions, but has emphasized the need for **credible and reasonably validated** answers from the different key information sources. All answers have been validated by triangulation of the different findings.

### Main clients

The primary client for this evaluation is the government of Sweden, as the donor, and Government of Republic of Zambia as the recipient government. Secondly, FAO and ILO, as the two implementing UN agencies are the clients for evaluation. Finally, the other stakeholders involved in the execution of the project would use, as appropriate, the evaluation recommendations and lessons learnt.

### Evaluation criteria and questions

The evaluation used the DAC/OECD criteria as the basis for its assessment with specific attention for the emerging changes in the selected value chains, intended and unintended. This implied a focus on the user dimension of delivered outputs and attention for the issue of value for money. These different criteria also matched the ILO policy guidelines for results based evaluation. The YAPASA intervention guides provided the key information on objectives and indicators for information collection and analysis.

In the TOR a long list with evaluation questions had been specified in accordance with these different criteria. During the preparatory stage the evaluators have agreed with the YAPASA management and ILO evaluation manager on those questions that needed priority attention in the limited time available. Apart from that prioritization, the evaluators have responded to all other evaluation questions.

#### Evaluation calendar

<b>phase</b>	<b>Tasks</b>	<b>Responsible persons</b>	<b>timing</b>
1	Preparation of TOR	Evaluation managers	July
2	Identification and recruitment of evaluators	Evaluation managers	August/ September
3	Desk review, inception report, evaluation instruments	Evaluators	7-23 September
4	In country data collection: meetings & interviews	Evaluators	26 September – 3 October
5	Debrief session	Evaluators	4 October
6	Elaboration of draft report	Evaluators	6 – 17 October
7	Submission of draft report to key stakeholders	Evaluators	20 October
8	Circulation of draft report for comments	Evaluation managers	
9	Final report	Evaluators	
10	Approval of report by EVAL	EVAL	
11	Final report submitted to donors and stakeholders	Evaluation managers	

### 3. Methodology of the Evaluation

The evaluation has been carried out through a desk review, interviews with various stakeholders and field visits. For all steps the evaluators have elaborated guidelines, checklists and a basic interview format in order to ensure that all key evaluation questions were included. These different components of the methodology had been agreed upon prior to the implementation of this evaluation with the client. They served well to collect the required information for responding to the evaluation questions with sufficient reliability.

- **Desk review**

The evaluators have studied and read all relevant project documents: the approved program document, intervention guides (old and updated new ones), annual progress reports, training & workshop reports, GRZ policy reports, minutes of stakeholder meetings, ILO evaluation guidelines. For the desk study the evaluators had developed their guidelines in order to ensure and facilitate the extraction of relevant information. The evaluators used their initial findings to finetune their interview format and questions for the subsequent meetings, interviews and consultations. After this phase the evaluators produced their inception report describing and explaining the methodology, calendar and data collection plan.

- **Interviews and meetings**

Jointly with the ILO team agreement on interview and meeting schedules had been reached, striking a balance between the limited available time for field visits and data collection on the one hand and the key stakeholders and field visits necessary to acquire the best view on results and performance of the project on the other hand.

The two (inter)national consultants have worked together pair-wise during the entire data collection period in order to foster daily sharing of findings, sharpening their observations, exchanging their national and international experiences, and adjusting schedules for next days' meetings and interviews. In view of the short data collection period in the field and the long travel distances, this teaming was the most practical and effective way of working. Data collection took place by means of Key Informant Interviews (KII) as well as for the Focus Group Discussions (FGD).

The key stakeholders interviewed consisted of the following categories: ILO and FAO implementing staff; SIDA staff, government institutions, input supply companies, young soya and fish growers (men and women), buying companies; see Annex 3 for overview of organizations and persons interviewed. In this way the key actors of the two Value Chains have been involved in this evaluation. The sampling followed was based on the criterion of **diversity**: the need to interview all key VC stakeholders and collect their specific perspective on the changes and results of the project.

The main data collection method used during interviews and meetings was an open question format for KII and FGD. The FGD served in particular for the discussions with the primary participants of the project, the young farmers. An example of such an interview format is presented in Annex 4.

- **Debrief session**

The consultants presented their preliminary findings, comments and recommendations at a debrief session on the last day of their stay in Lusaka. This debrief was attended by key ILO & FAO staff and the Project Steering Committee. In general the feedback of the evaluators was well received. Some points were discussed and findings were adjusted. The debrief has served well as the final validation step.

### **Limitations of the evaluation**

The most obvious limitations which the evaluators faced were the long travel distances as the YAPASA sites are widely scattered in Zambia. That situation did not allow for visiting all sites. Only those sites have been visited where the project had really made a good start and achieved results. This may have led to a bias towards the better sites.

The ILO staff suggested the field sites to be visited and furnished the list with key stakeholders to be met. The evaluation team had a role in the final selection of sites, assuring that for each person & group met there would be sufficient time for the interviews and proper data collection and comparison.

Though this is not a limitation as such, it is proper to note that the evaluators have limited themselves to young farmers only. The development of YAPASA is still too soon to talk about employment creation for young labourers by VC businesses in the two chains.

Not all information was timely available, for example on the gender analysis conducted by FAO, and hence this could not be assessed and validated with staff during the interviews and field visits.

### **Stakeholder participation**

During the evaluation the YAPASA staff has not been involved in data collection themselves. The independent character of the evaluation had to be strictly adhered to. YAPASA participation might have introduced a bias in data collection, leading to desirable answers from recipients or beneficiaries of the programme. YAPASA staff only served as one of the key sources of information; both formally during interviews and more informally when the evaluators travelled with ILO staff to the project sites.

### **Adherence to evaluation norms and standards**

The consultants & evaluators have adhered to the norms and standards set for good evaluation. The communication and information on the purpose of the evaluation has been open and transparent.

## 4. Findings

The findings of the mid-term evaluation are classified as per the areas of the evaluation mentioned in the Terms of Reference. These areas are investigated by the evaluation team during the field visit while talking to the project team, members of the project steering committee, private sector partners, and the farmers, who are the ultimate beneficiaries of the project. There were six areas of the evaluation - relevance and strategic fit of the program, validity of M4P approach, design and strategies adopted by the program, project progress and delivery of results, efficiency of resource use, organizational management arrangements and impact orientation and sustainability. In each of the evaluation areas, there were one or more questions that helped the evaluators understand the project and measure its standing at the point of evaluation.

### 4.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit of the Program

YAPASA is a direct response to Zambia's Revised Sixth National Development Plan and a contribution to Zambia's long-term development objective.

The project results will contribute to the attainment of the Revised– 6<sup>th</sup> National Development Plan (R-SNDP) objective of 'Promoting employment and job creation and rural development, through targeted and strategic investments in sectors such as science and technology, agriculture and energy development'.

**To what extent is the project relevant / consistent to the development priorities for Zambia's agricultural sector in the Revised 6<sup>th</sup> National Development Plan?**

It will also contribute to the Government's vision as elaborated in the National Industrialization and Job Creation Strategy document which aims to create a total of one million new jobs.

YAPASA is an intervention that targets the How in achieving the objectives of the Revised 6<sup>th</sup> NDP and NEPAD led Rural Futures Programme.

YAPASA's approach is about attracting private sector partners to work with the youth as a priority group as part of their business in the value chain led activities. Its approach is to fast track the process achieving in 2 to 3 years what would normally take 5 to 10 years if invested in by private sector alone. This is relevant where the youth are targeted for support in job creation, and a greater impact is achieved in a shorter period.

Interviewed stakeholders, partners, and beneficiaries (refer meeting annex) all stated that YAPASA was relevant and supported the Revised 6<sup>th</sup>NDP. There are sufficiently interested private sector partners to support YAPASA in implementation which make the intervention strategy (M4P) relevant.

**Table 1: Relevance of Policy of Different Government Agencies with YAPASA**

Sl.	Government Ministry	Policy/Strategy	Goal/Strategic Objective
1	Ministry of Commerce Trade and Industry	Commerce Trade and Industry Policy	To support the effective development and utilization of domestic productive capacities as a means to increasing output and expanding employment opportunities
		Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise Development Policy	To facilitate creation and development of viable MSME's that contribute 30% towards annual employment and 20% towards GDP by 2018.
		Industrialization and Job Creation Strategy	To create 1,000,000 jobs targeting the unemployed, unpaid family workers and underemployed.



2	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock	National Agriculture Investment Plan	To increase fish production, productivity and value-addition through sustainable and efficient management of aquaculture.
			To increase sustainable crop production, productivity and value addition for a diversified range of competitive crops apart from maize.
3	Ministry of Youth and Sport	National Action Plan for Youth Empowerment and Employment	Boosting employment opportunities for young women and men
4	Ministry of Labour and Social Security,	Decent Work Country Programme	More and better employment opportunities created, with focus on targeted groups
5	Citizens' Economic Empowerment Commission	2013 -2016 Implementation Strategy	Value chain cluster development

YAPASA is well aligned with the Sweden's development strategy for Zambia whose priorities includes contribution to 'Increased employment opportunities in rural and peri-urban areas and opportunities to start and run productive businesses' (Sweden's Results Strategy for Zambia).

**To what extent is the project relevant to Sweden's results strategy (2013-17), the ILO DWCP of Zambia and country assistance strategies of FAO for Zambia?**

ILO's focus is rural economic development, MSME development and social economy development of which YAPASA contributes to all of these broad based focus points.

FAO's focus is on reducing rural poverty while increasing decent employment opportunities for rural youth of Zambia and country assistance strategies of FAO for Zambia.

There is a shift in modalities of implementation from the traditional (working with Governments and NGOs) approach to now working with private sector partners – SIDA.

SIDA fully supports the M4P approach and this is one of their favoured development approaches for future programmes as of now. The YAPASA programme with its M4P approach fits well with the broader SIDA interpretation and therefore has relevance.

The project is relevant to the targets set by supporting the following listed benchmarks:

**Is the project relevant to achieve the targets set in the Decent Work Agenda for Africa (DWAA) and ARM conclusions?**

- By increasing investment → All private partners (Businesses with signed agreements with YAPASA) visited are using own and borrowed funds (CEEC) as additional investment sources for their businesses.
- Increasing access to credit → The finance model has changed here to accessing credit from a large input supplier – MRI Syngenta and not from financial institutions for inputs. Mechanization is accessed from commercial banks.
- Enhancing skills of the labour force → SSFs receiving training in conservation farming, business and productivity.
- Increasing employment especially for the youth → Project supports engagement of smallholder farmers in business models and encourage a significant proportion to be youth. The project also ensures that youth are integrated in the market system by partner companies without any exception.

- Creation of an enabling environment → Project has increased trust levels and facilitated business partnerships between businesses and SSFs, but still to show results at the policy level. The policy support interventions are still at the representative body formation stage for soya. For Aqua there is ADAZ is waiting for funding support from SAPP-IFAD.
- Improving transparency → Increased information flows between farmers and outgrower companies has raised transparency levels. Partners were free with the sharing of information on their businesses.
- Promoting MSME and women's participation → Visited groups had an almost equal representation of women (to men) in numbers at the meetings and did not raise any issues of gender discrimination.  
By using UN agencies (ILO & FAO) to implement there is greater pressure on implementing partners to adhere to the UN good practises guidelines → Some partners had been dropped where good practices have not been to the expected level; the example was Victor Series, a private sector business that is donor dependant heavy.

YAPASA fits well with the Musika market led M4P approach funded in part by SIDA with a national geographic focus. Musika provides business model solutions to small and medium-scale agri-business and small grants to large businesses to encourage them to reach out to small scale farmers. Support is not commodity specific as long as it is not a donor blacklisted commodity e.g. tobacco.

**To what extent does the project complement and fit with other on-going Swedish initiatives, ILO and FAO programmes and projects in the country?**

The FAO CASU programme targets to improve input supply and public sector extension delivery through supporting conservation farming, crop diversification and improved productivity. This programme has a geographic presence in 31 districts reaching 230,000 farmers through 19,500 lead farmers with a commodity focus on legumes, oil seeds and maize. YAPASA has used funding from SIDA to upgrade the existing E-voucher system funded by the EU to include credit management in the E-voucher system.

SIDA is and has been supporting the E-voucher payment system development with CASU -FAO and ZNFU to support the Governments FISP input delivery to smallholder farmers. YAPASA is working with CASU-FAO to include the soya outgrowers to be E-voucher beneficiaries.

The YAPASA project is working with FAO to support Youth SSFs' to grow soybeans using conservation farming practices, with improved productivity which is a good rotation crop with maize. These are all complementary to the FAO-CASU project which FAO is implementing and has extended support to YAPASA Youth farmers together with private sector input supplier trainers.

Some of the private sector businesses partners, JEDO and REGITECH, have received grant support from Musika in the form of motorbikes to assist the outgrower extension staff to better reach the YAPASA Youth outgrower members.

The relevance here is that Musika and FAO projects are able to support and share information learned from other project implementation with the YAPASA project.

Below is a list of other small scale farmer value chain programmes implementing in Zambia which have different levels of similarity to the M4P approach.

**Table 2: List of Smallholder Value Chain Projects in Zambia**

Name	Implementer	Primary funder	Geographic focus	Number of farmers/SMEs	Programmatic focus	Commodity focus
<b>CASU</b>	FAO	EU	31 districts	230,000 through 19,500 lead farmers	To improve input supply and public sector extension delivery to support adoption of CF practices	Legumes, oil seed, maize
<b>MAWA</b>	CRS	USAID	2 Districts (Lundazi and Chipata)	20,000 through 1000 lead farmers	Improve rural livelihoods through a multidimensional approach.	Groundnuts, sweet potato, soy, sunflower
<b>Profit +</b>	ACDI/V OCA	USAID	All Eastern Province (Lundazi, Chipata, Katete and Petauke)	200,000	Value chain approach to boost productivity and link farmers to competitive formal markets	Maize, groundnuts, sunflower, soy
<b>Conservation Farming Unit (CFU)</b>	CFU	Norway & DIFID	In 7 provinces but not in Muchinga, Northern, Luapula and NW	500,000 farmers over 5 yrs 2,600 lead farmers working with 120 farmers every year	Expand conservation farming adoption through lead farmer approach	All
<b>COMACO</b>	COMACO	USAID	Eastern Provinces	Not available	Link farmers to markets and extension services	Groundnuts, soy, sunflower
<b>Musika</b>	Musika	SIDA	National		Provide business model solutions to small and medium-scale agri-business.	All
<b>Siaoma</b>		USAID/AGRA	Central and Southern Provinces	600 agro-dealers	To develop input and output markets through agro-dealer development	All
<b>Heifer International</b>	Heifer International	Irish Aid, DIFID, Oxfam, ADB, GRZ, WB	SP, EP, CopperbeltP, CP, NP (21 Districts)	30,000 Hhs (70 Community Facilitators) 16 Aggregation centres	VC focus supporting dairy, small livestock & soybeans. With market linkages, structures, aggregation & capacity building	All with main support to dairy, small livestock & soybeans
<b>IDE</b>	IDE	SIDA, EU, TAFE	SP, CP, Lsk P, Copper P, NWP (15 Districts)	20,000 200 FBA - Agrodealers	Capacity building, input & output linkages, finance & credit	All
<b>WFP (UN) – R4</b>	DAPP	SDC	Pemba	2,850 farmers, 200 lead	Risk management using 4 strategies - disaster risk reduction, risk	Crop diversification e.g. pulses

				farmers, 1 agro-dealer	transf risk re	Is the intervention an appropriate solution to the development problem at hand? Does it target the main causes of the problem?
--	--	--	--	------------------------	----------------	--

The main challenges faced are guided by the impact performance indicators which the programme targets to address. These are increased incomes to the rural youth either as entrepreneurs or employed, and improved soya and fish productivity levels.

**Impact Performance indicators in detail**

- At least 3,000 new decent jobs created for young men and women
  - At least 5,000 youth owned/managed enterprises have started up and/or improved operations
  - At least 10% increase in incomes for targeted rural youth
  - At least 20% increase in production yields of soy beans and aquaculture
- Yes, the intervention is appropriate to solving the problems –through increasing enterprises and contributing to increased number of jobs and improving low soya and fish yields. All these factors increase income earnings to a greater number of rural based youths.
  - Unemployment and poverty strongly affects young people as registered youth unemployment in Zambia stands at 28% in the age group 20-24 years, 15% in the age group 25-29 years, and 11% in the age group of 30-34 years, whereas the overall unemployment rate stands at 7.9%.<sup>1</sup> There is not segregated data for the age group of 18-20, as that age group falls under the broader age group of 15-20 and the unemployment rate in that group is 56%.
  - Case-specific evidence shows that unemployment figures for rural areas are higher
  - Youth unemployment rates will continue to rise since 280,000 women and men newly enter the labour market in search of work every year while labour absorption capacity remains largely unchanged.
  - Young people are strongly disadvantaged in the competition for the approximately 700,000 jobs in the formal economy since they typically lack the skills, work experience and social networks of their older peers.
  - Poor macro policies, droughts and a slowing global economy have created an economic downturn for Zambia
  - The programme is contributing to the impact indicators but will not meet the targets in the planned timeline; but should go past these targets post programme completion. The relevance here is that the programme interventions should have high sustainability levels post implementation support.
  - Yes, as an entry point solution. The current strategies are relevant and consistent but they require to be broadened and deepened in order to achieve the desired overall impact levels. Thus being able to make significant contributions to living conditions from the expanded production and entrepreneurship enterprise base.
  - The programme is facilitating sustainable livelihoods attainment for young women and men in rural areas of Zambia through the promotion of sustainable micro-, small and medium-scale enterprises (MSMEs). Two medium scale enterprises visited in the Kasama (Northern Province) have each invested over US\$300,000 into processing equipment and outgrowing support (micro

Is the intervention consistent with the livelihood strategies and living conditions of its target group? How urgent is it from the point of view of the target group?

<sup>1</sup> Labour Force Survey 2008, Page 21

target group). This is relevant in creating the desired market pull effect for the supported production base at a local level.

- These two medium enterprises (Kasama) are planning a wide soya processed product base for human consumption (for the local market in Zambia for now), where awareness of alternative protein sources from soybeans will be supported by local availability with the businesses investing in marketing support through advertising/sensitization and an effective distribution networks.
- The target group is showing urgency for this youth support; from the programme samples visited of the youth groups being supported, the participants expressed hunger for opportunities to earn income especially those that are sustainable post project. All were willing to contribute labour such as digging fish ponds and clearing fields for planting as their contribution in the agreed timelines. These labour contributions were especially challenging for the female youth (relying on manpower – theirs) whom have not been deterred in completing the agreed tasks.

#### 4.2 Validity of M4P Approach, Design and Strategies Adopted by the Program

Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P) approach has some pre-requisites. There should be providers of product or service in the market, and the beneficiaries should be able to pay for accessing those products or service, meaning they cannot have

**Is the project right to apply an M4P approach in the current thin-market context in Zambia?**

zero asset base. Zambia has a GDP of US\$ 3,917 per capita (PPP) and US\$ 1,143 per capita (Nominal)<sup>2</sup>. It received a lower middle-income country status by the World Bank in 2011. Although the income inequality is huge in Zambia with a Gini coefficient of 55.62<sup>3</sup>, there are a large number of private sector companies available in different sectors, including in the agricultural sectors where YAPASA is working. The government of Zambia is very much supportive of the development of private sector through some initiatives. There are facilities for access to finance from different ministries, and the Citizen's Economic Empowerment Council (CEEC) and some of the YAPASA partner companies have already accessed those funds. In addition to providing funds, the government is also trying to give policy support to the private sector as there is a clear understanding that the government cannot run the development initiatives all on its own.

The sectors chosen by YAPASA – Soybean and Aquaculture - are not new in the context of Zambia, but these are new for the young smallholder farmers, who are the target groups for the project. Because of the existence of these sectors, there are already some private companies engaged in the sector, sometimes on a large scale. The commercial farmers are engaged in Soybean cultivation for a long period, and there are a good number of fish hatcheries in the private sector that are operating in Zambia.

These private companies also have inter-firm relationships going between them, without project intervention. For example, one of the outgrower companies of YAPASA for the last year (2014-15) was Wind of Change, and they sold the produce of the farmers to another company locally – Jedo Commodities. The project has decided to work with Jedo Commodities in the following year (2015-16). This type of inter-firm collaboration shows a level of maturity in the market and helps in implementation of M4P projects. The impression of a thin market situation in Zambia was due to the vastness of the country and the disperse population, especially in the rural areas. But, the market is not that thin as it may look at first in Zambia, as evidenced by the number of large players in Soybean sector.

---

2

<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2016/01/weodata/weorept.aspx?pr.x=41&pr.y=19&sy=2016&ey=2020&scsm=1&ssd=1&sort=country&ds=.&br=1&c=754&s=NGDPD%2CNGDPDPC%2CPPPGDP%2CPPPPC%2CLP&grp=0&a=>

<sup>3</sup> <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.GINI?locations=ZM-MZ&view=chart>

Table 3 shows good competitive market in the Soybean sector in Zambia and the market is growing. To meet the demand of these private sector companies, more farmers need to cultivate Soybean, and more hectares of land need to come under cultivation. With the target of engaging 5000 youth for YAPASA, it can be clearly seen that just one large company is enough to fulfill the target. So overall, the market condition is not that thin as it was envisaged during the project design and the conditions are in favour of applying M4P approach for implementation.

**Table 3: Soybean Quantities Purchased with Processing Capacity 2016**

No	Processor Name	Quantity Purchased in 2015 (MT)	Quantity Purchased in 2016 (MT)	Actual Operational Crushing Capacity
1	Cargill	90,000	75,000	90,000
2	Mount Meru	25,000	40,000	110,000
3	National Milling	18,000	15,000	18,000
4	Quality Commodities (ETG)	18,000	18,000	22,000
5	Iman	12,000	12,000	30,000
6	Saber Foods	10,000	10,000	10,000
7	Nutrifeed	7,000	5,000	8,000
8	Novatec	7,000	7,000	7,000
9	Tiger Animal Feeds	5,000	5,000	8,000
10	Olympic	4,000	4,000	5,000
11	<b>Global</b>		20,000	150,000
	<b>Total</b>	<b>196,000</b>	<b>211,000</b>	<b>448,000</b>

ILO has been working in partnership with private sector companies through various initiatives for a long time and is well known for its reputation of working with the private sector. FAO also works with the private sector, but comparatively less than ILO. FAO is well-known for its wealth of knowledge in agriculture and rural development. So this joint implementation by ILO and FAO gave both the UN organizations an opportunity to learn from the culture of one another. ILO, through its lab and International Training Center, has been engaged in the theory and implementation of M4P projects in various countries. Implementation of YAPASA gave both ILO and FAO practical experience of implementation of M4P project on the ground, learning from which can be taken to other country offices and in the respective headquarters for future program design. Having the involvement of two UN agencies in one single project also opens up the door for future collaboration between other UN agencies in future projects. ILO Office for Zambia is responsible for three countries – Zambia, Malawi, and Mozambique - and that gives it the opportunity to look at other project implementation options in these countries. Other UN agencies like UNDP and the UN country representative have also shown interest in the possibility of collaboration in the implementation of projects together by two or more UN agencies. As UN organizations, both ILO and FAO can take the learning from YAPASA and carry it globally, something which is not possible for the majority of the management consulting firms and implementers of M4P projects. The donor of the YAPASA project, SIDA, also looks at the collaboration very positively. So far they are happy with the collaboration between ILO and FAO and would like to engage in bigger collaboration in the future.

**What have been the advantages / disadvantages of implementing the programme as a joint ILO / FAO programme?**

In the implementation of M4P projects on the ground, ILO and FAO were both new. In the design of the project, ILO Lab was supposed to provide technical support to the project team in grasping the concepts. The lab supported an initial mission in November 2014 to help guide the project, funded the MRM position initially and organized a market facilitation training. The lab also provided ad hoc advice or consultation to the project based on specific request. Even with these support, as per our evaluation,

we believe that the guidance should have been more intense and systematic. Their support helped the project staff a little, but not up to the extent that was envisaged in the project design and the staffs learned more by doing things by themselves and by making some mistakes in the early days. This helped the project to have a much firmer understanding of the market, private sector implementation partners and the modality of implementation, which is typical in an M4P project. This lesson should guide the planning of effective support and steering for any future project design. The support from FAO was more technical and not intended to enhance the understanding of the project staffs on M4P as an approach.

YAPASA had one-year inception phase from October 2013 to August 2014. During the time of inception, the project tried to define its outcome, output and performance indicators and the logframe in the project document for implementation phase captured those outcome, output and performance indicators. During the inception period, the project decided on selection of the second sector after Soybean. For that purpose it conducted two sector studies through outsourcing and initiated a few pilot interventions. The project team did not have a clear understanding of the market dynamics at the end of the inception period, especially because they were not engaged directly in the conduction of sector assessments.

**Has the design appropriately defined outcomes, outputs and performance indicators and targets? Was the project design realistic?**

For that, from the actual implementation phase in September 2014, the project team identified gaps between the logframe and real market situation. With internal discussions and brainstorming, the project decided to change its logframe by defining the outcomes and outputs differently. Some of the performance indicators also changed accordingly. This revised logframe was still not approved but reflected a better understanding of the real market situation by the project team. The project objective was kept the same with the same performance indicators, but the means of verification changed to reflect the way Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED) monitoring system is applied. Some of the changes that the revised logframe incorporated were:

- The number of outcomes was reduced from four to three; the improved public perception and demand for soybean products for human consumption, and of the rural economy as a source of youth employment (meta-level) was taken out as an indicator.
- Some corresponding outputs for outcomes has also changed: eight corresponding outputs were reduced to seven.
- The performance indicators/ targets against different outcomes and outputs were changed; for example, social marketing campaign target was reduced to four from ten and number of activities aimed at influencing changes in policy, legal and regulatory provisions for soya and aquaculture value chains has increased from two to five.
- The means of verification for the performance indicators has also changed in many instances.

All these changes were made to reflect the realistic market situation that was somewhat missing in the logframe developed at the end of the inception phase. It needs to be mentioned here that it is very difficult for an external evaluator to understand all these changes that took place, how those changes took place, and who initiated and approved those changes etc. In general, YAPASA did not have a very clear documentation trail that provided this explanation, and in the coming months, this documentation needs to be proper.

In terms of having a gender balance in the project, YAPASA always had a very active role with its private sector partners. Female participants are included in different types of

**How have gender issues have been addressed in the project?**

interventions. In Zambia, like in most other countries in the world, females are expected to carry out household chores and taking care of children much more than their male counterparts. In Zambian rural areas, a lot of women get married at an early age and have babies quickly. Even after that, a good number of women were selected by the implementation partners because of YAPASA. YAPASA was not able to reach a complete gender balance in terms of having equal number of male and female

beneficiaries, but there was always an active and concerned role from the project. The ratio of male and female is not exactly equal, but for every intervention and with every implementation partner, there is a good mix of both of them. The following table gives a summary of gender segregated beneficiaries as reported in the June 2016 meeting of the steering committee.

**Table 4: Partners and Beneficiary Data of YAPASA Up to 2016**

Sector	Private Partner	Gender Segregated Beneficiary
<b>Soybean</b>	Wind of Change	201 farmers, 183 youth (132m, 51f)
	Manyika Investment	98 farmers, 14 youth (10m, 4f)
	Victor Series Production	252 farmers, 178 youth (120m, 53f)
<b>Aquaculture</b>	Palabana Fisheries	30 farmers (17m, 13f)
	Vyazala Crops Limited	30 farmers (23m, 7f)

Generally, the private sector partners are also supporting the project with the inclusion of women as the value chain participants and beneficiaries in both Soybean and Aquaculture. The project was also able to maintain equality in the number of male and female project staffs, which made the work environment more congenial, friendly and suitable for implementation of this type of project. FAO conducted a gender analysis of YAPASA project, but strangely the project staffs are unaware of it and not using it in their day to day work. A relatively simple gender assessment tool and guide to gender sensitive Outgrower scheme was developed as part of the assessment and YAPASA needs to make best use of these tools in its work.

**Picture 1: Young farmers in Aquaculture Sector participating in an FGD<sup>4</sup>**



### 4.3 Project Progress and Delivery of Results

Since there were changes made in the outputs and outcomes in the project logframe, it was a bit confusing to assess to what extent the project was expected to achieve. The evaluation team looked at both the original logframe and the revised logframe to reflect on the most recent situation of the project. The number of outcomes was reduced from four to three in the revised logframe and the following table presents the outcomes in the two versions of the logframe:

**To what extent have the expected outputs and outcomes been achieved or are likely to be achieved in relation to its results framework or operational objectives?**

<sup>4</sup> We took permission from people while taking the pictures, but not sure if it will be a problem for publication.



Original Logframe Outcomes	Revised Logframe Outcomes
Improved public perception and demand for soy bean products for human consumption, and of the rural economy as a source of youth employment (meta-level)	<i>removed</i>
More enabling business environment for young entrepreneurs to start and formalize businesses in soy bean and aquaculture value chains (macro-level)	More enabling business environment for young entrepreneurs to start and formalize businesses in soy bean and aquaculture value chains with adequate information on business opportunities in the value chains
More young people respond to economic opportunities in soy beans and aquaculture market systems (micro-level)	More young people respond to economic opportunities in soy beans and aquaculture market systems (micro-level)
Value chain development partners along the Soy Beans and Aquaculture sectors collaborate and coordinate effectively and efficiently (cross-cutting).	Value chain development partners along the Soy Beans and Aquaculture sectors collaborate and coordinate effectively and efficiently (cross-cutting).

The evaluation team supports this reduction of the number of outcomes: the first outcome ‘*improving the public perception*’ is certainly outside the scope and skills of the project at this experimental implementation stage. In correspondence with this outcome reduction also the number of outputs was reduced from 10 in the original logframe to 7 in the revised logframe; the 3 planned outputs to achieve the ‘public perception’ outcome were not re-planned again in the revised logframe. Currently YAPASA is implementing its activities following the revised logframe, although it is yet to be approved. Precise aggregated data on outputs – planned and achieved – were not available, but the evaluators also wish to stress that for the proper assessment of the YAPASA it is more important to critically look at the outcomes and how the project learnt and adapted its work plan then to assess how well or strict the work plans were implemented and outputs achieved.

The performance indicators against the outputs and outcomes are unlikely to be achieved by YAPASA within the project duration. The project was expected to reach 5,000 farmers within the project period, but the report to the steering committee in June 2016 states that with all the private sector partners combined, the project is likely to reach up to 1,960 beneficiaries.<sup>5</sup> In this sense, the project is clearly off-track in achieving the outputs and outcomes.

The main reason for this is that the time spent during the inception phase and the first year of implementation was needed for better understanding of the market dynamics. The timing of the project was also a bit problematic, as the implementation was signed at the end of September 2014 and the planting season for Soybean was right at the corner at that time. This situation did not give proper opportunity to the project to find quality partners and develop stronger interventions for the first year, especially in Soybean. There were also many changes in the project team and a bit of difficulty and delay in finding suitable replacements. A change in the leadership position - 2 CTAs and one interim CTA in two and a half years and change in other key positions and delay in recruitment of MRM manager and portfolio managers- did not help the project to keep on target. But now the project having a much better understanding of the market situation has identified the right type of partners who are carrying out the interventions not just for project interest, but for their business interest. This is true market development, and we expect that after the project completion, these private sector partners will continue implementing the interventions on their own and increase the number of

---

<sup>5</sup> YAPASA Steering committee June 2016 progress report

beneficiaries for their business interest. We did not visit all the partners of the project during the evaluation period but tried to calculate the number of beneficiaries the visited project partners are likely to reach and even exceed after the project duration. These initiatives were undertaken by the project with the partners, so YAPASA can surely claim the outcomes and outputs beyond the project period.

**Table 5: Current and projected future outreach by partner companies<sup>6</sup>**

Partner Name	No of YAPASA Current Outgrower Entrepreneurs	No of Other outgrower / customer Entrepreneurs (Beyond YAPASA)	Business Future Outgrower Target	New jobs within partner entities	Value Chain
<b>Palabana Fisheries</b>	30 expanding to 60	110	200	7 (8 to 15)	Aquaculture
<b>Wind Of Change Enterprise</b>	221 reduced to 200		1,500	2	Soya
<b>REGITECH</b>	100		1,000	18	Soya
<b>JEDO Commodities</b>	500	3,613	4,113	19	Soya
<b>Go Commercial Scheme</b>	110		440	3+20 future 83	Mechanization services
<b>Total</b>	970	3,713	7,253	69	

YAPASA is working in two growing sectors in Zambia. In Soybean, there are a number of other development projects working for the development of the sector, but in aquaculture not many development sectors are present, especially in the locations where YAPASA is operating. In that aspect, YAPASA can claim almost all the numbers in aquaculture on the ground as no other project is working with the same partners at this moment. For policy intervention, however, there are other projects working and hence YAPASA cannot claim all results. In Soybean, attribution on the ground is more problematic as most of the private sector partners are working not only with YAPASA but also with other development projects and entities like Musika, SAPP and CEEC. The DCED monitoring system discusses the attribution method for these types of situation and YAPASA needs to clearly apply this attribution estimation accordingly; this has not been done as yet.

**To what extent can the identified results be attributed to the activities of the Project intervention?**

<sup>6</sup> MRI Syngenta employment figure is not mentioned here, as they are no front line implementers and they are working in the background with other partners in Soybean, just the way feed company in Fisheries sector is not mentioned

As the project team was not involved in the sector assessments for Soybean and Aquaculture, they had limited knowledge regarding the market dynamics and the actors involved in the sectors. For this reason, in the first year of implementation, YAPASA was only able to work with partners that showed interest in working with the project and was not able to reach out to more prospective partners. The project also suffered significantly on the access to finance intervention. The intended partners, financial institutions, backed out after long negotiations. The project had limited control over it since the overall macroeconomic condition of Zambia was the reason for the failure of the project in bringing the financial institutions on board. The project looked for alternatives and was successful in getting one of the largest input companies – MRI-Syngenta on board for Soybean sector in providing input credit to the farmers through outgrowers.

**Were outputs produced and delivered so far as per the work plan/results frame work? Has the quantity and quality of these outputs satisfactory? How do the stakeholders perceive them? Do the benefits accrue equitably to men and women?**

The project was not successful in creating any such alternative in the aquaculture sector and due to the absence of large lead firms in the input and output side of aquaculture value chain, the project had to invest money to demonstrate the success of the model of working with smallholder fish farmers. The project also faced difficulty with specific species of fish fingerlings, as some of the species that the project planned to promote were banned by the Ministry of Fisheries as they regard those as threats to other local fish species. Although investment to demonstrate a new model by the project is alright as per the principles of market development, YAPASA was unable to explore all possible options for access to finance. There are specific facilities in different government agencies, including in the Ministry of Youth and Sport and Department of Fisheries that could have been tapped. Both these agencies are members of the steering committee, and still, the project was unaware of these potential sources of funds. The project team is not very big, and they have to cover a large number of geographic areas with a relatively good number of private sector partners. In addition to this, the project needs to maintain liaison with different government agencies and sector representatives for policy related activities. With this structure of human resource, the outputs achieved so far can be termed as moderate with the limitations mentioned.

The stakeholders of the project are very positively motivated – from the donor and government counterparts to the implementation partners and the final beneficiaries. The relevant government agencies – Ministry of Youth and Sports, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Fisheries – believe that YAPASA is contributing to the achievement of their objectives. The extension officers of the relevant government agencies are also engaged in the implementation of project activities. The implementing partners are confident that with the activities done and planned with YAPASA, they will be able to enhance their business, local prominence, and income. For the final beneficiaries, the project is contributing to improve their livelihood and increase their income. The project also actively tried to have a gender balance and worked with its partners to ensure inclusion of women at various stages as beneficiaries. This was evidenced during the interviews conducted with the young farmers in both the sectors – Soybean and Aquaculture.

**Picture 2: FGD participants in the Soybean sector**



During evaluation, the team did not have enough time to meet all the partners and visit all the areas of project implementation. Based on the exposure of the evaluation team, it can be said that YAPASA made better progress in Soybean sector in the Northern Province. The project has been successful in identifying a good number of rightly motivated

**In which area (geographic, component, issue) does the project have the greatest achievements so far? Why and what have been the supporting factors?**

private sector partners for the implementation of project activities. These partners have a great deal of ownership of the work and are in line with the project objective of including young farmers as beneficiaries. Northern Province is the favored investment destination in Zambia, and this has helped YAPASA in finding these implementing partners in the locality. The local leadership and power structure (chiefs and headmen) are also taken into confidence for the smooth implementation of project activities. Northern Province also offers less impact of climate change, especially with regular rainfall. The majority of the farmers in Zambia are still dependent on rain-fed crop cultivation, so this is of immense importance for the project. In some other parts of the project implementation (like in Chibombo), farmers badly suffered because of lack of rain. Other development projects working in the Northern Province area collaborated positively with YAPASA and worked hand in hand with the partners to achieve similar objectives. In some instances, YAPASA took the assistance of other development projects (Musika) to identify and negotiate with additional private sector partners in the second year of implementation. Although Soybean is a new crop for most of the farmers, they have knowledge about its profitability and good marketability as commercial farmers are cultivating Soybean for a long time. The young and smallholder farmers also had hunger to get linked with the market input source and information source, and this has helped the project in implementing its activities through its partners with relative ease.

The activities that YAPASA is trying to implement currently are grounded on the understanding of project staffs about market dynamics. The interventions are not fundamentally unique and given the availability of a right set of things, these types of interventions are replicable in other projects in Zambia, in other sectors for a possible extension of YAPASA and even in other M4P projects in other countries.

**Do observed innovations have potential for replication? Are there any unintended results of the project?**

The set of conditions that should be present for possible replication of interventions are:

- The right intention of private sector companies, they should not look at a project as a source of fund, rather should see the activities as their own business and project as an additional helping hand.
- The market support structure and favorable policy environment, the business enabling environment and the policy support from the government, should promote participation of more private sector engagement, and the government should not see the private sector as their competitor.
- Dissemination of how the model works and what are the critical success factors. It is difficult for others to replicate things without knowing the details of implementation challenges. YAPASA should take the initiative to document and promote the details of implementation to other private companies using different media so that it becomes easier for them to replicate similar interventions.
- Solutions adapted to local context. The success of any intervention in any project lies with the adaptation of it in the local context. YAPASA interventions in that sense cannot be copied and pasted in another context, rather they should be carefully evaluated to ensure the right type of adaptation to the local context.

YAPASA also had some good **unintended results** from some of its interventions and implementation partners. These took place without any explicit involvement of the project resources both in terms of personnel and monetary involvement. These observed unintended results are:

- YAPASA is working in one value chain with one specific group of beneficiaries. In some of the locations where irrigation facility is available, the implementation partners saw the opportunity to work with the same beneficiaries to grow other profitable crops. This gives them certain advantage like working with already trained farmers, comparatively less supervision cost, utilization of their field staff round the year etc. The farmers are also happy as they have additional income opportunities using the same field and can build stronger relationship with the outgrower companies. Both Wind of Change and Jedo Commodities identified this opportunity and used the trained Soybean farmers in producing Onions under similar outgrowing scheme.

**Picture 3: Onion is grown using the same farmers who were trained for Soybean**



- One private sector partner, Wind of Change, is focusing on developing environmentally friendly products using crop residue. In Zambia, most of the farmers burn their crop residue in the field after harvesting and major portion of this valuable resource gets wasted. Wind of Change is collecting crop residue from the farmers and converting those by making organic fertilizer and high quality bricks that can be used as fuel for cooking.
- Some of the parents of the trained young fish farmers became interested in fish farming after their children got training from Palabana Fisheries and discussed about it at home. They consulted with their children on how fish cultivation should be done and with that advice built additional ponds on their own.

YAPASA has made impressive grounds in taking the interventions on track after taking a long time during inception and the first year of implementation. To ensure continuation of good results of the interventions and to make the project more effective, following issues need to be considered carefully:

**What can be done to make the intervention/ programme more effective?**

- Follow-up both Soybean and Aquaculture outgrower partners and ensure that these models work successfully. The project now has a good number of partners with limited human resource, so it needs to be cautious on adding new partners
- Deepen the number of income-earning activities for each outgrower through additional enterprise inclusions. Both Soybean and Aquaculture can only provide income during specific months of the year, but there can be other opportunities in the locality that can be promoted together with the current interventions. In some cases, private partners are doing it already at a limited scale – see the earlier mentioned example of Wind of Change producing onions with outgrower farmers who have access to irrigation - and the project can have its role in extending these initiatives by the private partners where large number of farmers can be benefitted.
- Offer JEDO Commodities an exchange visit to Viachi – Go Commercial Scheme and support JEDO to develop their tractor mechanization model to the next level. Share the Viachi – Makomba farm model with other commercial farms for possible replication.
- Reorient the program officers in their role from partner network development to a more mentoring and monitoring (data capture) role. The documentation related to changes that happened in the project is particularly weak, and that needs to be a focus area for the coming months, especially for the monitoring and result measurement manager.
- Leverage input companies to provide credit support rather than relying on commercial finance. There is already a good example of the MRI –Syngenta experience/model and this model needs to be shared with other input suppliers across the value chains.
- Try to keep as much of the human capital that has been developed in the program for a possible extension/phase two.
- Make sure the guidelines /processes and lessons learned from implementation journey are well documented for sharing both nationally and globally, especially in the areas where there is a global knowledge gap like M4P project implementation by joint UN bodies. Also the documentation can be shared with FAO and other relevant UN agencies for their better understanding of M4P project implementation

#### 4.4 Efficiency of Resource Use

The total project budget for YAPASA is not very large; it is just over US\$ 6.9 million. The project also has a relatively lean structure regarding human resources. There was some restructuring in the number of project staffs from the project document: an addition of two Monitoring and Results Measurement (MRM) persons and one additional car with driver. These changes were necessary for the implementation of the activities as the monitoring work under any M4P project is pretty heavy, and it is unrealistic to expect that the implementation staffs will be able to carry out the MRM responsibilities in addition to their core tasks – identifying right partners, negotiate with them on implementation and financial arrangements, and monitor their activities in the field. The project staffs also had to travel a long distance and having two cars instead of just one helped project staffs' movement in the field frequently. We believe the resource distribution could have been better if the project could have more implementation staff stationed in the implementation locations, especially when the project is having a large number of private sector partners.

**Could ILO and FAO's work have been implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the results? Could more of the same results/outputs have been produced with the same resources?**

In the inception phase of the project, it completely outsourced the two sector assessments and did not engage its staffs in the process. That caused a lot of delays in the understanding of the market dynamics by the project and eventually led to delays in implementation. This could have been avoided, as the engagement of project staffs in sector studies is of extreme importance in any market development project and can never be fully outsourced. Also during the inception period and the first year of implementation, conceptual and practical support from experienced M4P practitioners was scanty. The project should have engaged additional resources with enough on-the-ground M4P implementation experience to support the project staffs to grasp and tackle important implementation issues.

Overall, the project had a conscious effort to ensure the quality of results, although the quantity is unlikely to be achieved during the project lifespan as already mentioned before. But now that the right design is in place, the private partners are likely to go beyond the project target after the implementation period without additional project resources.

The evaluation team did not have enough scope and time to review any alternative better use of the available resource beyond the sectors where the project is working.

**Was the intervention economically worthwhile, given possible alternative uses of the available resources? Should the resources allocated to the interventions have been used for another, more worthwhile, purpose?**

#### 4.5 Organizational Management Arrangements

The project had a very unrealistic design in the project document for implementation where there were only one car for movement of all project staffs in the field, no dedicated MRM person for the project and responsibility of monitoring given to the portfolio managers and no permanent project staff presence in the field levels. This was quickly understood by the project managements and they reallocated the budget to have provision for one international MRM expert with one MRM associate and two cars instead of one. These changes helped the project greatly. But still there were no changes made in terms of staff presence at the field levels. We understand the possible difficulty to set up offices in different locations by ILO or FAO, but this could have been outsourced through other organizations. If the project decides to do

**Are the available technical and financial resources adequate to fulfil the project plan?**

this, it needs to be careful in choosing the right type of organization that have sufficient orientation beyond direct delivery model. The project suffered to some extent because of frequent change in the positions of project staff, especially that of CTA. From the beginning, the project had two CTAs and one interim CTA in between. The directions provided by these different individuals were sometimes not very easy and consistent for all other project staffs. YAPASA does not have a huge target as compared to other M4P projects and hence, the available financial and technical resources are adequate for achieving the project targets and fulfilling the project plans.

The donor, SIDA, received reports and updates about the progress of the project regularly. Things that are going well and things that are off-track were communicated and advice sought from SIDA. Based on the situation, SIDA also provided appropriate guidance to the project management. When the project was struggling with the initial design of its access to credit intervention, SIDA allowed YAPASA to drop the idea of working with financial institutions to provide credit and the project was able to develop a more creative solution by engaging a large input company in providing input credit to the farmers. The steering committee regularly meets to know about the project progress and to provide their guidance for project implementation. But in the structure of the steering committee, only representatives from the government and donor are present. We believe the steering committee could be more fruitful if there is representation from the private sector as well, as the core approach of the project is working with the private sector.

**Is the management and governance arrangement of the project adequate? Is there a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?**

YAPASA is anchored in ILO and the line of communication between ILO and FAO country offices is not very clear. For example, the CTA has no direct reporting/communication arrangements with the country office of FAO, even though the two offices are on the same block. This lack of formal communication arrangements can hamper the capturing of learning and leveraging the available network and resources for the organizations.

The project staffs were not very familiar with M4P approach in the beginning and they struggled to understand the concept in the early days. But after spending time with the market players, they now have a much better understanding of their tasks and how to achieve project objectives. The members of the steering committee and the technical working group of the project did not have any exposure to the concept of M4P approach and it was difficult to provide right guidance to the project because of the lack of this understanding. YAPASA arranged training on DCED for the steering committee members, but it was not fruitful. This was probably because the project wanted to give too much technical information to the steering committee members where they are not responsible for day to day implementation. Rather they need overall understanding of market systems and market facilitation approach. The project can organize a short orientation on M4P principles with some practical experience/example for them to facilitate this understanding.

The project, however, did well in orienting the partners, as they understood their roles and tasks in the market development approach very well and they were motivated to work for the benefit of their business as well as contributing to the achievement of project objectives. YAPASA needs to look at options of bringing ILO and FAO country offices and head offices contribute in the project as much as possible for getting a much greater leverage. For example, ADAZ, the fisheries association is struggling in negotiation with SAPP, a project where FAO country office has great influence. As ADAZ is also a partner of YAPASA, the project could facilitate a more direct communication to ensure provision of funding for ADAZ from SAPP.



The project put great emphasis in establishing a monitoring system from the onset of the project. The project staffs were trained on the concepts of DCED standards of monitoring and results measurements, although that could have provided a better result if it would have been organized after the initial stage of intervention implementation. Nonetheless, the project had a monitoring system in place and result chains were developed to assist the project staff in improving their activities. The project used these result chains in the bi-monthly meetings to review the progress and this system eventually helped the project to make necessary adjustments in project implementation and revision of the result chains. The project received support from the experts of ILO lab that helped them understand the process better including sponsoring of DCED mock audit, but in most of the occasions the review was done in-house without any external support. The project can look at the possibility of engaging external expert in the review at least twice a year.

**How effectively has the project management monitored project performance and results? Is a monitoring & evaluation system in place and how effective is it? Is relevant information systematically collected and collated?**

YAPASA depends on the implementation partners to gather and report data. This system is less costly and easy for the project staffs, but it has risks of false reporting. The project needs to do more first-hand monitoring to capture field level data or engage a third party provider to gather data for the project. The project did not have very good experience with third party data collection during the first soya pilot, but this can be minimized with appropriate briefing and higher engagement at different stages of data collection. For the data/information provided by the partners, the project needs to have a random checking system to ensure the data quality is good and the information provided is accurate.

The technical, administrative and political support structure for the project from ILO and FAO headquarters and the national partners seemed adequate, with some limitation on the availability of expert M4P implementers in the project. The understanding of the project team and implementation partners about local power structure and political situation is helping in smooth implementation of activities.

**Is the project receiving adequate administrative, technical and - if needed - political support from the implementing organizations (ILO and FAO)? Does the program get necessary support from the implementing organizations in Zambia and their headquarters?**

The project donor SIDA was concerned by the slow progress of the project as like any other donor; they have to report to their parliament on the investments they make. The project implementation has been affected by the high turnover of staffs, especially in the role of the CTA. The project had to revise some of its targets because of the delays in the early period of implementation and unfavorable macroeconomic situation for access to credit intervention. YAPASA maintained close communication with SIDA to address these concerns and revised the relevant targets to make things more realistic. The stakeholders were happy with the revised approach and progress of the project and did not raise any major concerns during the time of mid-term evaluation. The relevant ministries that are the national partners of the project are all involved in the steering committee and have an overall idea about what is happening with the project. The private sector companies are adequately engaged in the implementation of the project. Overall, the relevant stakeholders are involved appropriately and sufficiently through the steering committee (SC) structure. The inclusion of the private sector in the SC is seen to have the potential to strengthen the program implementation.

**Are all relevant stakeholders involved in an appropriate and sufficient manner?**

The rules and regulations of a UN organization can sometimes be cumbersome for the private sector companies. But during the evaluation, the private sector companies expressed that they are ok with the administrative, and financial rules and regulations of ILO and those did not put any hindrance in their work. Some of the companies expressed that the turnaround time of YAPASA is much faster than government offices. These private companies have previous working experience with other donors and donor funded projects, so they are familiar with the requirements of a project. Although the rules and regulations in ILO and FAO are not business-like, because of the past working experience of the private sector partners with different NGOs, they have adopted with the process and requirements. Internally the project had a lot of flexibility, and it could reallocate the budget lines within limits based on the changing market scenario without exceeding the overall budget. This flexibility is of immense importance in the implementation of any market development project.

**Do ILO and FAO administrative and financial rules and regulations enable the implementation of an M4P approach and do admin and finance turnaround times facilitate a quick response to market opportunities?**

#### 4.6 Impact Orientation and Sustainability

The project is not likely to achieve the targets set out in the logframe, even the revised one. As discussed before, it took much longer time for the project staffs to grasp the concepts of M4P, understand market dynamics and get the right set of implementation partners. Changes in the project leadership also had some negative effects regarding target achievement. But after much struggle and burning some fingers, the project staffs were able to identify the right partners and negotiate the right set of activities with them. The ground reality guided the current set of interventions in both Soybean and Aquaculture sectors, and the implementation partners have a clear business incentive to carry these forward on their own, even after the project support is over. The interventions developed by the project also ensured a win-win situation for both the implementation partners and the young farmers and hence the relationships between the parties are likely to continue beyond the project period.

**Is the programme strategy and programme management steering towards impact and sustainability?**

The majority of the partners put great emphasis on building goodwill and trust relationships with the outgrower farmers, and do not treat them as mere suppliers. When the evaluation team asked if the farmers would be willing to sell products at a slightly higher price to outsiders (side-selling) during the time of harvest, they responded in the negative unanimously. They also understand the value of the relationship, the support from the outgrower companies in providing high-quality inputs, continuous technical knowledge, and ready market access. The unintended results, briefly described in chapter 4.3, are already illustrating the copying or multiplier effects that happen at farmers and company levels. This is perfectly in line with the M4P approach and demonstrates again the potential larger impact to be expected in the near future.

The management of the project is very supportive and flexible to revise the strategy to ensure that the project can absorb actual and potential shock (e.g. high financial interest rate guided the project to have an input credit system, establishing soybean policy action group where no specific association was present). The office set-up also allows continuous discussion about any issues faced by the team, and there is an effort to solve these by brainstorming together. The project team has an excellent relationship and very good communication with the private sector partners. All these are positive for having a lasting impact on an M4P project like YAPASA.

The project actively looked at the environmental sustainability of all the interventions. In some instances, the project partners are taking initiatives for a sustainable use of natural resources on their own without any specific project support. Some of these instances are:

**Is the intervention compatible with a sustainable use of natural resources? Or is it harmful to the natural environment?**

- Promotion of Soybean helps in maintaining soil fertility, especially as a rotation crop with Maize. The selection of Soybean automatically ensured enhancement of soil fertility.
- The project is also promoting more organic practices by applying inoculants and organic fertilizer in the soil and not much of chemical fertilizer.
- YAPASA is also promoting conservation farming among the beneficiaries.
- In Aquaculture, the project partners are using high-density polythene sheets in the soil for better conservation of water and avoid leaching.
- One specific partner (Wind of Change) is motivating farmers to stop burning crop residue and collect that residue from them. It then uses the crop residue to make organic fertilizer and alternative fuel (brickets). This practice helps in the reduction of pressure on deforestation.

The evaluation team has not been able to access further specific information on these examples and to what extent such practices are actually being applied by how many farmers. The evaluation team did not see anything that might be harmful to the natural environment as part of project implementation. Some of the issues related to Aquaculture were addressed in the following way:

- Diverting water sources; ponds visited are using water from boreholes. The diversion here was that instead of being used for crops it is now being used for fish farming.
- Water contamination, Fish farming is environmentally friendlier than for crops which require higher levels of chemical (herbicide and insecticide) use. Fish pond waste which is mainly in the form of manure can partially replace chemical fertilizers for crop production.
- Potential impacts on fish species in the adjacent streams; Fisheries is very aware of this risk and has already intervened by restricting in areas where non-indigenous fish can be used for fish farming. This has even delayed project implementation for aqua farmers in certain areas. Where there is a risk to fish species in adjacent streams farmers have been guided to use local species that are found in these streams for fish farming such as the 3 spot bream.
- The project avoided promotion of specific species of Nilotica in specific Provinces based on the discussion with the Department of Fisheries as these species are deemed as a threat to some of the indigenous fish species.

YAPASA adopted promotion of technology at different levels of its activities. The interventions on the ground in partnership with the private companies are designed whilst keeping the capacity of the farmers in rural areas in mind. The training that the farmers received included certain technical information related to crop cultivation and aquaculture, and these were easily understood and adopted by the farmers. The project did not try to promote very complex methods and techniques to the farmers that they will not be able to do in their own setting.

**Is the technology utilised in the intervention appropriate to the economic, educational and cultural conditions in the partner country?**

YAPASA is trying to implement a Farmer Input Voucher Management System (FIVMS) together with CASU project of FAO. CASU-FAO already had a system in place that captures seasonal and crop information concerning smallholder farmers through an electronic voucher system. With YAPASA the system can now handle a credit management scheme as well. Some of the features of this system are:

1. The e-voucher brings together the farmers, agro-dealers, and the suppliers
2. Access to inputs by farmers
3. When the farmer swipes, the stock is then recorded as collected, the information is available to all three parties
4. Farmers can be traced
5. The system captures seasonal and crop information
6. The system is real-time providing immediate updates of recorded activities
7. The system is able to capture information regarding ground proofing for rainfall pattern for insurance tracking the system
8. Agrodealers base their orders on historical orders and specific requests from farmers.

9. At the time of loan payment, all the farmers are working with the off takers where the card is swiped to show payment which is immediately entered into the system and is available to all parties.
10. As long as there is basic mobile network the system can work.

The project became aware of this system late for the 2015/16 Soybean season and signed up each of the three Outgrower partners as 'agro-dealers' for the management of their credit with MRI-Syngenta. Farmers were not intended to have e-vouchers themselves at that stage. This year YAPASA is using this system for all the outgrower companies, both old and new with the rollout in Aquaculture in early 2016 with individual farmers having e-voucher cards to track disbursements of inputs and management of their loan repayments. With amendments to the Credit Management module, YAPASA has been able to roll out the full functionality to individual farmers for 2016/17 season. This system is very transparent and useful for all parties although there is a question of sustainability as it is not very clear who will handle this after the completion of YAPASA and CASU. There is an intention in CASU management for the FIVMS platform to become a national and even regional initiative – either owned by the government or by a university.

YAPASA is also supporting another private company, Payltapp, to develop a comprehensive agricultural commodity management system named Uagro. Under that system, a farmer will be able to put any available product for sale, and potential buyers can purchase according to their demand. To help farmers putting their products on sale, the system will employ agents, primarily agro-dealers in different localities, who can serve farmers on a commission basis. This system also has an automated payment mechanism that can reduce the transaction cost. This system is developed as a web-based system and requires a smartphone to access it. Most of the farmers in the rural areas do not have smartphones, and the internet connection is often poor. There is a system of recruiting agents with smartphones who will work with farmers without any smartphone, but that will also be very challenging in distant rural places. The software development company also do not have very clear understanding of the practical challenges on the ground in the rural areas. The current system is unlikely to be adopted on a large scale in recent future.

## 5. Conclusions

The conclusions have not been organized as per the evaluation questions, because that would have led to many repetitive statements. Instead, the conclusions have been formulated in a more overall, comprehensive manner.

YAPASA is a project with a relatively small number of project staffs for implementation of activities in two sectors in the rural areas of Zambia to create additional income and job opportunities, especially for the young farmers. The project is designed keeping in line with the objectives of the donor for the country and in line with the development goals of different ministries and government agencies. The project has aligned its top line objectives with Zambia's 6<sup>th</sup> National Development Plan and hence is very relevant in the current context of the country. Although this project has a limited scale, it gives the opportunity for learning at various levels. It is the first time in Zambia that two UN agencies are working together in a market development project. The successes and learning from this project can be taken not only to other projects in Zambia but also to the regional level and international level. The donor of the project is extremely eager to see that happen in the near future and willing to extend its support for that. There is already some interest from the UN office in Zambia to facilitate joint implementation of two or more UN agencies, and ILO and FAO should take that discussion forward.

Zambia being a middle-income stable African country with presence of a good number of private sector players offers application of M4P as an approach for project implementation. The sectors chosen by the project have unmet demand, and the past growth trend was very good, both of which are elements of a potentially successful program. ILO and FAO joint implementation gave the opportunity of using rich technical know-how of both the organizations, but conceptualization and application of M4P was challenging by the project team. The project outcome and outputs had a modest target, keeping in mind the newness of ILO and FAO in the implementation of M4P approach. YAPASA also had a very conscious effort in engaging young people and ensuring gender balance among its beneficiaries.

The project spent considerable time during inception but made a critical mistake by not engaging staffs in the sector assessments. This delay had a lasting impact during the first year of project implementation and critical time was lost. The project team now has a much better understanding of the market dynamics, identified the right type of partners in implementation, but because of that initial delay, the project is unlikely to achieve its performance indicators within the lifespan of the project. But a successful M4P project has an advantage over traditional NGO-led program delivery model in the sense that the activities can continue without project support beyond the lifetime of the project. YAPASA was able to identify the right type of partners that have a clear business interest in continuing the activities that are undertaken together with the project and will likely to surpass project targets but after the project duration. The project needs to carefully estimate its attribution factor, especially in Soybean sector, as most of the private sector partners also work with other development projects in the same geographic areas.

YAPASA received support from ILO lab on M4P approach and from other ILO and FAO resources on technical aspects. The project staffs still struggled initially to grasp the concept and implementation modalities, and they learned it only by putting themselves in the market scenario and engaging with market actors. The financial resources in view of the targets seemed adequate, and the overheads and common expenses charged were within an acceptable limit. The donor of the project, SIDA, and the national partners showed very good support to it all along, by providing guidance and assistance where required. The private sector partners also felt that YAPASA did not show a bureaucratic nature, which is very important for an M4P project. ILO and FAO even changed the designation of the project staffs from traditional National Program Officer to a more business like Portfolio Manager, which showed commitment from these two UN agencies about the project.

YAPASA leadership tried to keep impact objective in mind in designing and redesigning the interventions and reallocated budget according to the demand of changing situation. The

interventions seemed to provide sustainable impact without harming the natural environment. Overall the project has the right momentum that needs to be kept until the end of the project to ensure things do not fall apart.

## 6. Lessons Learnt

The project had some learning already that can be helpful for the rest of the time of project implementation as well as for other future projects.

- 1. Flexibility in implementation and financial management:** The project faced challenges in terms of intervention design in the project document and the situation on the ground that calls for adjustment in activity and financial allocation. The CTA of YAPASA took the decision of altering the modality of intervention implementation together with project staffs and made required budget line change to ensure availability of funds for the intervention. The project also communicated with the donor about it and they approved this change quickly.
- 2. Documentation regarding changes in the project needs to be clear:** The project has undergone changes at different levels because of the changing market conditions. The documentation is not there or not properly organized to show all these changes. The project was successful in making decisions to implement required changes and it should be a priority of the project to correct all relevant documents related to these changes. The documentation should be accessible in a way that these can be used as learning document for future project implementation.

## 7. Recommendations

YAPASA completed more than half of its implementation time already and developed a solid understanding of the market where it is intervening. Certain areas of the project need to be strengthened for successful completion and specific things needs to be given attention for similar future projects.

1. **Improved line of formal communication.** YAPASA is implemented jointly by ILO and FAO where ILO is the lead implementing agency. The CTA and other project staffs sits in ILO office in Lusaka. Although the budget lines are different for ILO and FAO, on the technical matters, there is no clear line of communication between the project and FAO. This can create scope for less synergy for the project and reduced opportunity of learning for both ILO and FAO. There should be a formal, regular line of communication between the leadership of YAPASA and the country office of both ILO and FAO to enhance cross-learning and ensuring leverage from the experience and expertise of each other.
  - Recommendation forwarded to: ILO and FAO country offices / headquarters
  - Importance/Priority: High
  - Timeframe for implementation: As early as possible
  - Resource implication: None
  
2. **Improvement in documentation.** Concise documentation in the project is not up to the standard. There have been many changes in the project since developing the project document at the end of the inception phase. These changes include – addition of MRM expert in the project team, purchase of one additional car for the project, change in intervention strategy and implementation modality etc. These changes are not very easy to find and tracked. The project needs to have a very precise documentation formats to capture all these changes, how these changes took place, who authorized these changes etc. to ensure complete transparency.
  - Recommendation forwarded to: Project Management
  - Importance/Priority: High
  - Timeframe for implementation: As soon as possible
  - Resource implication: None
  
3. **Improve the application of DCED standard.** YAPASA has successfully embraced the M4P approach, but the use of the DCED standard has not received sufficient attention. In order to get a complete understanding and overview of its results (outcomes and impact) YAPASA must improve its application of the DCED standard, looking at the attribution dimension and the systemic changes (copying effects, crowding in effects) in particular. This will also imply the measurement of all 3 universal impact indicators: income, number of young farmers and employment (at company levels).
  - Recommendation forwarded to: Project Management
  - Importance/Priority: High
  - Timeframe for implementation: As soon as possible
  - Resource implication: Low to medium (engagement of MRM expert might be necessary)

4. **Develop and disseminate communication materials.** YAPASA has already been able to generate some interesting early signs of impact and learning from the field implementation. Because of the lack of a communication expert in the team, these are not well captured yet in a format that is easily understandable by the wider community. These communication materials are important to ensure the processing of challenges and successes of the project and dissemination of those so that ILO, FAO and other UN agency can use those in their respective projects nationally, regionally and internationally. The project can specifically emphasize on the advantages and challenges of M4P project implementation by joint UN bodies.
  - Recommendation forwarded to: Project Management, ILO and FAO country offices
  - Importance/Priority: Medium
  - Timeframe for implementation: Throughout 2017
  - Resource implication: Low (engagement of additional communication expert)
  
5. **Improving the logframe.** The logframe of the project underwent some changes by the project team, but still it does not reflect the ground reality completely. The project team is aware that they are not going to achieve even the revised logframe targets. The MRM expert of the project, in association with other members of the project team, should immediately revise the logframe to reflect the scenario on the ground and get it approved by the donor.
  - Recommendation forwarded to: Project Management
  - Importance/Priority: High
  - Timeframe for implementation: As soon as possible
  - Resource implication: None
  
6. **Ensuring year-round income for the beneficiaries.** The project worked in two sectors Soybean and Aquaculture. Both the sectors are growing, provide good income opportunity for the beneficiaries and good business for the private sector partners. But both these sectors provide only seasonal income opportunity for the farmers. The young farmers will remain idle for a large portion of the year if they only get themselves engaged in one of these sectors. YAPASA, by design and intention, is not a value chain development project, rather selected value chains are entry points for the project. The ultimate objective is to create jobs and improve the livelihood of target beneficiaries. There is scope in some locations for the farmers to do both fish cultivation and Soybean production. In some other areas, the private sector companies can engage the farmers in cultivation of other crops in different season, if provision of water can be ensured. Some farmers are willing to engage in small businesses like production of village chicken or small piggery. The project can look at these possibilities to engage in supporting the beneficiaries so that the beneficiaries can get a round-the-year income.
  - Recommendation forwarded to: Project Management
  - Importance/Priority: Medium to low
  - Timeframe for implementation: If decided, as soon as possible
  - Resource implication: Low to medium
  
7. **Possibility of future joint program with other UN agencies.** Other UN agencies and the UN country representative in Zambia showed interest for future joint implementation. YAPASA should support this with proper communication and documentation and both ILO and FAO country office management need to take this up for making it a reality. A future joint program can be with ILO and UNDP or FAO with another UN agency, and not necessarily engaging many UN agencies in one project.



- Recommendation forwarded to: ILO and FAO country offices, UN coordination body
- Importance/Priority: Medium
- Timeframe for implementation: Medium term, dialogue for this can continue
- Resource implication: None to very low

8. **Seeking possibility of multi-donor funded project.** There is a scope of joint funding from multiple like-minded donors. There is precedence of joint funding by different project in different countries. Katalyst has been a joint funded project in Bangladesh and AMDT in Tanzania is also funded by multiple donors. SIDA, the current donor of YAPASA project is also willing to explore the scope of joint funding of a project with other donors that can be implemented by one or more UN agencies. ILO and FAO country offices and headquarters need to make serious efforts to ensure this.

- Recommendation forwarded to: ILO and FAO country offices and headquarters
- Importance/Priority: Medium
- Timeframe for implementation: This can start in the later part of 2017
- Resource implication: Low to medium (travel and associated expenses)

## 8. Lessons Learnt

### ILO Lesson Learned Template

**Project Title:** Decent Jobs for youth and Improved Food Security through development of Sustainable Rural Enterprises (YAPASA)

**Project TC/SYMBOL:** ZAM/13/04M/SID

**Name of Evaluator:** Ben Haagsma; Sadruddin Imran and Ivan Stubbs

**Date:** December 28, 2016

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
<b>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</b>	Flexibility in implementation and financial management:
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	The project faced challenges in terms of intervention design in the project document and the situation on the ground that calls for adjustment in activity and financial allocation
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	ILO Staff
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	<p>Some of the interventions were not progressing as per the design in the project like access to finance by engaging the financial institutions because of the overall macroeconomic condition of the country and lack of interest from the financial institutions. The project tried to identify alternative solution by engaging input company to provide credit facility and supporting them with guarantee in case of Soybean. In Aquaculture, the project directly intervened with credit facility since no input company was interested to provide credit support to farmers. The project management made necessary financial adjustments in the budget line to facilitate that process.</p> <p>Because of the bold step by the project, the intervention could go ahead and the private sector partners got courage to engage young beneficiary farmers. The farmers also received necessary inputs together with training that helped them start their operation as Outgrower.</p>
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	<p>The CTA of YAPASA took the decision of altering the modality of intervention implementation together with project staffs and made required budget line change to ensure availability of funds for the intervention. The project also communicated with the donor about it and they approved this change quickly.</p> <p>The young farmers received support in the form of input credit which was denied by the formal financial institutions.</p>

ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	NO
--	----

## ILO Lesson Learned Template

**Project Title:** Decent Jobs for youth and Improved Food Security through development of Sustainable Rural Enterprises  
.(YAPASA)

**Project TC/SYMBOL:** ZAM/13/04M/SID

**Name of Evaluator:** Ben Haagsma; Sadruddin Imran and Ivan Stubbs

**Date:** December 28, 2016

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
<b>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</b>	Documentation regarding changes in the project needs to be clear
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	The project has undergone changes at different levels because of the changing market conditions. The documentation is not there or not properly organized to show all these changes.
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	ILO Staff
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	<p>The project document that was developed after the implementation phase was not grounded on the reality of the field as some of the planned interventions were superficial. This happened primarily because the project team were not engaged in sector assessments. The interventions could not take place as planned and YAPASA had to change some of the interventions when the project team gained better understanding of the market context. Also on the administrative side the project document mentions purchase of one car, which is unrealistic if we consider how much area the project needs to cover for implementation. Also different people needs to go to different places at the same time. There was no provision of MRM expert in the project document, and the MRM responsibility was gives to the portfolio managers, which was quite unrealistic.</p> <p>The project management understood these difficulties and approved the changes required in intervention. The project purchased one additional car to facilitate movement of its staffs. The project also hired one international and one national MRM staff and made necessary adjustments in the budget line. But these changes are not properly documented which can raise question about how these changes were made, who made the decision about these changes etc.</p> <p>The project benefitted from the changes, but because of the lack of proper documentation trail, its reputation can be hampered.</p>
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	The project was successful in making decisions to implement required changes and it should be a priority of the project to correct all relevant documents related to these changes. The documentation should be accessible in a way that these can be used as learning document for future project implementation.

ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Proper documentation
--	----------------------

## Annex 1: Terms of reference

### Independent Mid-term Evaluation of

## Decent jobs for youth and Improved Food Security through the Development of Sustainable Rural Enterprises (YAPASA)

August 2016

### 1. Background and rationale of the program

#### a. Introduction

The Rural Youth Enterprise for Food Security RYE-FS initiative (branded as YAPASA) is part of broader programmes of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) to promote decent work and food security in Zambia. Interventions seek to exploit the distinct competitive advantage of local sector-specific production systems to unlock youth entrepreneurship as an engine of employment creation and to boost food security, for example by seeking to boost production quantities through commercial young farmer development.

The development challenge being addressed in Zambia through this UN Joint Programme (UNJP) is youth unemployment and food insecurity in rural communities. The programme facilitates attainment of sustainable livelihoods for young women and men in rural areas of Zambia through the promotion of sustainable micro, small and medium-scale enterprises (MSMEs). The initiative contributes to the broader effort of the Government of Zambia to implement the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP) of the African Union at national level; it furthermore responds to the call from the Rural Futures Initiative launched by the AU-New Economic Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) planning agency for alternative development models that “promote broad-based rural economic development and reduction of poverty and inequality including securing decent jobs and sustainable livelihoods.

The direct recipients of the programme are selected national-level and sector-level governmental, non-governmental and private sector intermediary organizations with a mandate to promote sustainable business in the rural economy of Zambia, among them prominently the Ministries of Agriculture and Fisheries & Livestock and their executing agencies, national level employers and workers federations and their respective sector associations, and district-based business development support service providers. The ultimate programme beneficiaries are young women and men living and working in rural districts of the country where economic activities related to the prioritized agricultural value chain concentrate.

The programme focuses on the two value chains of soy beans and aquaculture. Soy beans have been classified by NEPAD as a strategic crop for boosting national food security. The production and processing of soy beans already provides income to ninety one thousand (91,000) rural households in Zambia, with volumes set to increase on the back of fast growing regional and global demand. Similarly, aquaculture is also a sector of strategic importance to Zambia, with the country facing pressure on capture fisheries resulting in an annual fish deficit of 100,000mt. Aquaculture is the most viable option for arresting this supply shortage. There are only 6,500 smallholder fish farmers contributing less than 15% of the 13,000mt of aquaculture fish. The two sectors are mainly rural based and have scope to absorb youth at different levels of the value chain.

In order to unlock the employment creation potential along the aquaculture and soy beans value chains, though, numerous competitiveness challenges need to be overcome - including poorly functioning input supply systems for fingerlings and fish feed, low productivity and market linkages, low volumes of processed soy bean and negative consumer perceptions on the nutritional value of soy bean. These development challenges present opportunities for youth employment creation in rural areas.

In this regard, two value chain analyses and market analyses undertaken in the Programme Inception Phase generated an informed understanding of how the two market systems function and identified key sector competitiveness factors and inter relationships with key market players and facilitators that need to be further developed to address these challenges.

The overall development objective of the Rural Youth Enterprise for Food Security Programme is to facilitate creation of decent jobs for youth and improved food security through the development of sustainable rural enterprises. The Programme is designed to contribute to the achievement of the following strategic frameworks:-

- a) **Zambia’s Revised Sixth National Development Plan (R-SNDP)** overall goal of attaining accelerated infrastructure development, economic growth and diversification; promoting rural investment and accelerated poverty reduction and enhanced human development. Pursuant to the above objectives, the SNDP focuses on policies, strategies, and programmes that contribute to addressing the challenges of realising broad based pro-poor growth, employment creation and human development as outlined in the Vision 2030.
- b) **Outcome 2 of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)** on “Targeted populations in rural and urban areas attain sustainable livelihoods by 2015”
- c) **Priority 3 of the Zambia Decent Work Country Programme (ZDWCP)** on “More and better employment opportunities created, with focus on targeted groups”
- d) **Priorities 1, “Production and productivity improvement in crops, livestock and fisheries” and 2, “Food and nutrition security improvement”**, within FAO’s country strategy

The Programme is funded by the Government of Sweden through a Standard Administrative Arrangement (ILO-Sweden Financing Agreement) signed on 29<sup>th</sup> August 2013 in which it was agreed that Sweden would finance the Joint Programme to the sum of the USD equivalent of SEK 46,075,000. An initial twelve (12) months Inception Phase was implemented from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2013 to 31<sup>st</sup> August 2014, for which USD2, 639, 232 was disbursed. Subsequent funding for a thirty six (36) months Implementation Phase was approved by SIDA after submission of an Inception Phase Report in July 2014 and positive outcome of review meeting between main Programme Partners.

#### b. Program snapshot

Project code	ZAM/13/04M/SID
Funding/Donor	SIDA
Budget	SEK 46,075,000 (approximately US \$ 6.9m)
Duration	October 2013 - August 2017
Geographical coverage	Selected districts in Zambia – Active project sites in: North Western Province: Solwezi, Northern Province: Kasama, Luwingu and Mungwi; Central Province: Chibombo and Mumbwa; Lusaka Province: Chongwe; Southern Province: Chirundu
Key Log frame targets (impact performance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3,000 decent jobs created for rural youth and 5,000 enterprises with improved performance</li> <li>• 10% increase in incomes for targeted rural youth</li> <li>• 20% increase in production yields from soybeans and aquaculture</li> </ul>
Major components (outcomes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved public perception and demand for soybean products and of rural economy as a source of youth employment (meta-level)</li> <li>• More enabling business environment for young entrepreneurs to start and formalize businesses in soybean and aquaculture value chains (macro-level)</li> <li>• More young people respond to economic opportunities in soybean and aquaculture market systems (micro-level)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Value chain development partners along the soybean and aquaculture value chains collaborate and coordinate effectively and efficiently (cross cutting)</li> </ul>
--	--

## **2. Project Management**

### **a. Implementation arrangement**

The programme is jointly implemented by ILO and FAO in consultation with the tripartite ILO constituents: Government of Republic of Zambia; employers (Zambia Federation of Employers) and workers (Zambia Congress of Trade Unions).

ILO HQ also acts as Administrator of the project funds and passes on a prescribed portion of the overall budget to FAO. The project implementation team comprises staff from both ILO (5) and FAO (2) sitting within the ILO Lusaka offices under the leadership of an ILO Chief Technical Advisor CTA.

The ILO Director is the principle staff responsible for programme implementation. The CTA supervises the staff, allocates programme budgets, prepares progress reports, maintains programme relations with institutional partners, elaborates the final programme document and develops work plans.

A Project Steering committee is established, chaired by the Ministry of Youth, Sport and Community Development with representation of other relevant GRZ Ministries (Agriculture; Livestock and Fisheries; Commerce Trade and Industry; the ILO Social partners (ZFE) and ZCTU) and the heads of ILO and FAO,

The project is directly backstopped by the Decent Work Team (DWT), ILO Pretoria and in particular the Specialist on Job Creation and Enterprise Development, and at HQ level by the Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) unit of the Enterprise Department. The project also draws on technical expertise from the FAO HQ in Rome and the FAO Regional office in Harare.

### **b. Program approach and methodology of delivery**

The program follows making markets work for the poor (M4P) approach. The approach basically seeks to play a facilitative role to unlock the systemic constraints that are prohibiting the young poor's gainful participation in the market. By playing a facilitative role to act on key systemic constraints, the program supports market actors to innovate and act in the market so that all the parties involved will benefit from the market sustainably.

Thus YAPASA emphasises the facilitative role, sustainability and systemic solutions and works with the market actors that have legitimate roles in the market system. These actors might be the public and private agencies as well as the associations, research institutions and other representative bodies assuming a key role in the market.

In order to avoid market distortionary effect of traditional development programs YAPASA has partnered with Private players in the market and has been working closely with key government agencies as a project collaborator. The project supports its ultimate beneficiaries, or rather active participants through the partner market players.

The YAPASA programme was set up to operate in two phases; first an inception phase to identify appropriate sector and subsectors for projected impact on youth employment, enterprise and food security followed by an experimental pilot and scale-up phase to test innovations in the selected market systems through small scale pilots followed by scale up to spread the innovation throughout the market system. The programme is innovating and expanding to achieve the set objectives by adopting the learning in the pilot phase.

## **3. Purpose, scope and justification of the evaluation**

### **a. Purpose of the evaluation**



The aim of evaluation in ILO and FAO is to support improvements in the program and policies and to promote accountability and learning. The independent mid-term evaluation serves two main purposes:

- i. To independently assess progress to date of the project across the four Major components (outcomes); assessing performance as per the foreseen targets and indicators of achievement; strategies and implementation modalities chosen; partnership arrangements, constraints and opportunities in Zambia;
- ii. To provide strategic and operational recommendations as well as highlight lessons to improve performance and delivery of project results. This includes assessing whether the strategies and tactics adopted by the programme are appropriate to the project environment, both internal and external, and the economic context in which the programme is working

#### **b. Scope of Evaluation**

The independent evaluation covers entire aspects of project including the project environment, project organization, project relevance and efficiency of resource utilization and effectiveness. Above all, sustainability and contribution to broader sectoral impact are crucial. The evaluation will assess all key results that were to have been produced since the start of the project.

Apart from these technical aspects it also covers organizational and managerial aspects including appropriateness of the design of the program and its strategic fit with the implementing organizations for Zambia, implementation arrangement of the program and its value addition to the implementing organizations and also the appropriateness of the program approach and framework in the economic context of the Zambia. So this evaluation is expected to look largely into:

- Project achievements and progress towards achieving the projected results
- Adherence to the plans of key stakeholders including the Government, donor and the private stakeholders (market players specifically) as well as ILO and FAO within the UN country team.
- Adherence to the systemic approach adopted by the program, M4P approach for the program delivery in line with the DCED standard for results measurement (for which a separate audit will be conducted shortly after this evaluation)
- Prospects for replication and sustainability of the interventions
- Strategic fit of the program for ILO, FAO, SIDA and government stakeholders in the host country
- Relevance, feasibility and desirability of the innovation planned through the intervention
- Influence of the intervention over donors, development communities and other development collaborators
- Existence and use of the project management system including, result measurement, change management, risk management etc.
- Strategic analysis of the program in terms of analysis of internal factors (strengths and weaknesses) as well as external factors (opportunities and threats)

#### **c. Timing of the Evaluation**

The independent evaluation of the program and its performance and progress is long overdue. It was originally planned for August 2015, after the first pilot, but in agreement with SIDA it had been agreed to defer it initially to January 2016, then later to after the soya harvest season (August 2016) by which time there would be more results from the ground to evaluate.

#### **4. Clients for evaluation**

The primary client for this evaluation is the government of Sweden, as the donor, and Government of Republic of Zambia as the recipient government. In addition, the two implementing UN agencies; Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and International Labour Organization (ILO) are the major clients

for evaluation both for the progress of the programme itself and for the organisational learning on the use of M4P approaches to systemic market change within UN systems. ILO and FAO offices and staff involved in the project (project staff, departments at HQ – in particular The ILO Lab (a special project within ILO, supporting DWCPs around the world to adopt M4P approaches), the technical backstopping department and the Regional Office for Africa (ROAF) will use the findings of the report. Tripartite constituents and other parties involved in the execution of the project would use, as appropriate, the evaluation recommendations and lessons learnt.

## **5. Evaluation criteria and questions**

The evaluation will cover the following evaluation criteria:

- a) Relevance and strategic fit of the program
- b) Validity of M4P approach, design and strategies adopted by the program
- c) Project progress and delivery of results
- d) Efficiency of resource use, set up and value for money
- e) Organisational Management arrangements
- f) Impact orientation and sustainability as defined in ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation<sup>7</sup>.

Gender concerns will be based on the ILO Guidelines on Considering Gender in Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects (September, 2007). The evaluation will be conducted following UN evaluation standards and norms<sup>8</sup> and the *Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management* developed by the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC). In line with the results-based approach applied by the ILO, the evaluation will focus on identifying and analysing results through addressing key questions related to the evaluation concerns and the achievement of the outcomes/immediate objectives of the project using the logical framework indicators.

## **6. Key Evaluation Questions**

In line with the results-based approach applied by the ILO, the evaluation will focus on identifying and analyzing results through addressing key questions related to the evaluation criteria and the achievement of the outcomes/ objectives of the project using the indicators in the logical framework of the project. The evaluator shall examine the following key issues:

### **A. Relevance and strategic fit of the program, (6)**

- to what extent is the project relevant/consistent to the development priorities for Zambia's agricultural sector in the Revised 6<sup>th</sup> National Development Plan
- To what extent is the project relevant to Sweden's results strategy (2013-17), the ILO DWCP of Zambia and country assistance strategies of FAO for Zambia?
- Is the project relevant to achieve the targets set in the Decent Work Agenda for Africa (DWAA) and ARM conclusions?
- To what extent does the project complement and fit with other on-going Swedish initiatives, ILO and FAO programmes and projects in the country?
- Is the intervention an appropriate solution to the development problem at hand? Does it target the main causes of the problem?

---

<sup>7</sup> ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 2012

<sup>8</sup> ST/SGB/2000 Regulation and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation

- Is the intervention consistent with the livelihood strategies and living conditions of its target group? How urgent is it from the point of view of the target group?

#### **B. Validity of M4P approach, design and strategies adopted by the program (5)**

- Is the project right to apply an M4P approach in the current thin-market context in Zambia?
- What have been the advantages/disadvantages of implementing the programme as a joint ILO/FAO programme?
- Has the design appropriately defined outcomes, outputs and performance indicators and targets?
- Was the project design realistic?
- How have gender issues have been addressed in the project document?

#### **C. Project Progress and delivery of results (6)**

- To what extent have the expected outputs and outcomes been achieved or are likely to be achieved in relation to its results framework or operational objectives?
- To what extent can the identified results be attributed to the activities of the Project intervention?
- Were outputs produced and delivered so far as per the work plan/results frame work?
  - Has the quantity and quality of these outputs been satisfactory?
  - How do the stakeholders perceive them?
  - Do the benefits accrue equitably to women and men?
- In which area (geographic, component, issue) does the project have the greatest achievements so far? Why and what have been the supporting factors?
- Do observed innovations have potential for replication? Are there any unintended results of the project?
- What can be done to make the intervention/ programme more effective

#### **D. Efficiency of Resource Use (2)**

- Could ILO and FAO's work have been implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the results? Could more of the same results/outputs have been produced with the same resources
- Was the intervention economically worthwhile, given possible alternative uses of the available resources? Should the resources allocated to the intervention have been used for another, more worthwhile, purpose?

#### **E. Organisational Management Arrangements (7)**

- Are the available technical and financial resources adequate to fulfil the project plan?
- Is the management and governance arrangement of the project adequate? Is there a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?
- How effectively has the project management monitored project performance and results? Is a monitoring & evaluation system in place and how effective is it? Is

relevant information systematically collected and collated? Is the data disaggregated by sex (and by other relevant characteristics if relevant)?

- Is the project receiving adequate administrative, technical and - if needed - political support from the implementing organizations (ILO and FAO)? Does the program get necessary support from the implementing organizations in Zambia and their headquarters?
- Is the project receiving adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners?
- Are all relevant stakeholders involved in an appropriate and sufficient manner?
- Do ILO and FAO administrative and financial rules and regulations enable the implementation of an M4P approach and do admin and finance turnaround times facilitate a quick response to market opportunities?

#### **F. Impact Orientation and Sustainability (4)**

- Is the programme strategy and programme management steering towards impact and sustainability?
- Is the intervention compatible with a sustainable use of natural resources? Or is it harmful to the natural environment?
- Are requirements of local ownership satisfied? Did agricultural stakeholders participate in the planning and implementation of the intervention?
- Is the technology utilised in the intervention appropriate to the economic, educational and cultural conditions in the partner country?

#### **G. Lessons Learned (2)**

- What good practices can be learned from the project that can be applied in the next phase and to similar current and future projects?
- What should have been done differently, and should be avoided in the next phase of the project or other similar projects?

### **7. Methodology**

The evaluation will be carried out through a desk review and field visit to some of the project sites to meet the market player partners and beneficiaries. Meeting and consultations with ILO and FAO management and staff, ILO technical back stopper of the program ILO-LAB in Geneva, Representatives of SIDA and the concerned government agencies will be undertaken. Evaluation team will develop checklist for the consultation, ensuring the key evaluation questions are covered and undertake thorough discussion with these agencies.

The independent evaluation team will review inputs by all ILO/FAO and non-ILO/FAO stakeholders involved in the project, from project staff, constituents and a range of partners from the private sector and civil society.

The draft evaluation report will be shared with all relevant stakeholders and a request for comments will be asked within a specified time (not more than 5 working days). The evaluation team will seek to apply a variety of evaluation techniques – desk review, meetings with stakeholders, focus group

discussions, field visits, informed judgement, and scoring, ranking or rating techniques. Subject to the decision by the evaluation manager a guided Open Space workshop with key stakeholders may be organised in Lusaka.

- **Desk review**

A desk review will analyse project and other documentation including the approved Program document. The team will also review various technical backstopping reports and relevant program documents including the intervention guides, Annual and semi-annual reports provided by the project management and Field and Technical Backstopping offices (ILO-Lab). The desk review will suggest a number of initial findings that in turn may point to additional or fine-tuned evaluation questions. This will guide the final evaluation instrument, which should be finalized in consultation with the evaluation manager. The evaluation team will review the documents before conducting any interview.

- **Interviews with ILO and FAO staff**

The evaluation team will undertake group and/or individual discussions with project staff in Lusaka, Zambia. Considering the joint implementation modality of the program, the evaluation team will also meet with both relevant ILO and FAO staff.

Since ILO has taken responsibility of overall administration of the program, the evaluation team will interview key staff responsible for the project administration including financial management, administrative management and communication. Apart from the Officials in Lusaka office, the evaluation team will also discuss with the technical backstopping officials both at the DWT in Pretoria and at HQ level such as the SME unit, including *the lab*. The project management team will furnish a list of the individuals to be interviewed in ILO upon the request from evaluation team committee

- **Interviews with key stakeholders in Lusaka**

Evaluation team will interview the key stakeholders including those representing the steering committee of the program and other important stakeholders including business membership organizations, relevant government bodies. The evaluation manager and the project management unit will furnish the list of all stakeholders to the evaluation team. The evaluation team will select respondents based on proper sampling technique from the list.

- **Interviews with the project participants**

Evaluation team will also meet with the project participants including the market players and beneficiaries to understand their feeling about the project results and approach adopted by the program. The project team will provide the list of interviewees.

- **De-briefing**

After the data collection and before producing the first draft report, the Evaluation team will present initial comments at a de-briefing session to a group including the ILO and FAO Country Directors, project management team, Project Steering Committee and SIDA

## **Main Outputs**

1. Inception report (with detailed work plan and data collection instruments)
2. A concise Evaluation Report (maximum 25 pages) as per the following proposed structure:
  - Cover page with key project and evaluation data
  - Executive Summary
  - Acronyms
  - Description of the project
  - Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation
  - Methodology
  - Clearly identified findings for each criterion

- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons learned and good practices
- Annexes:
  - TOR
  - Project Data Table on Project Progress in achieving its targets
  - Project Work plan: Level of completion of key activities
  - List of Meetings and Interviews
  - Any other relevant documents

### 3. Evaluation Summary, Lessons learned and best practices using the ILO template.

All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided to the evaluation managers in electronic version compatible with Word for Windows.

Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated and incorporated into the final reports as appropriate, and the Lead Evaluator will provide a response to the evaluation managers, in the form of a comment matrix (comments log), including explanations as to how comments were addressed or why any comments might not have been incorporated.

While the substantive content of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report shall be determined by the Evaluation Team, the report is subject to final approval by ILO in terms of whether or not the report meets the conditions of the TOR.

#### **Management arrangements, work plan & time frame**

- **Evaluation team**

The evaluation team will consist of one international evaluation consultant and one independent national consultant, who will accompany the international evaluator in the Zambia. The international consultant will be the team leader and will have full responsibility for the evaluation report. The team leader will be responsible for resolving any outstanding disagreements that may arise between the two evaluators. The team leader will work closely with the evaluation manager as needed to produce and submit one evaluation report in accordance with the deliverable schedule and contract specifications. S/he will be a highly qualified senior evaluation specialist with extensive experience from evaluations and ideally also the subject matter in question: Youth Entrepreneurship and Decent work creation. The national consultants will have particular experience in the areas of Agriculture and youth and food security with very high degree of understanding of the Zambian economy and society. Both the consultants should have an understanding of the Market System Development approach to development particularly the M4P approach. Consultants should have good understanding of the DCED standard for result measurement and should be familiar with the ILOs Policies for evaluation. The evaluation team will agree on the distribution of work and schedule for the evaluation and stakeholders to consult.

- **Evaluation Manager**

The evaluation team will report to the evaluation manager (Mr. Gugsu Yimer Farice, [farice@ilo.org](mailto:farice@ilo.org)) and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with the evaluation manager should issues arise. The evaluation will be carried out with full logistical support and services of the Decent Jobs for Youth and Improved Food Security through the Development of Sustainable Rural Enterprises (YAPASA) Project, with the administrative support of the ILO Office in Lusaka. ILO chief technical advisor for the YAPASA program Mr. Steve Morris and Assistant FAO Representative (Programmes) Gregory Chilufya will support the evaluators during the mission period

- **Work plan & Time Frame**

The total duration of the evaluation process is estimated to be 25 working days over an 8 weeks period from 15 August to 6 October 2016.

- **Evaluation Phases**

The evaluation will happen in the following main phases and time period aiming for submission of the final evaluation report to the donor no later than 6 October 2016.

Phase	Tasks	Responsible Person	Timing
I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparation of TOR</li> </ul>	Evaluation managers	1- 30 July
II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of independent international evaluator</li> <li>• Entering contracts and preparation of budgets and logistics</li> </ul>	Evaluation manager	25 July – 8 August
III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Telephone briefing with evaluation managers</li> <li>• Desk review of project and related documents</li> <li>• Inception report , including evaluation matrix</li> <li>• Evaluation instruments designed based on desk review</li> </ul>	Evaluators	11 - 19 August (7 days)
IV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultations with Project staff/management in Zambia</li> <li>• Consultations with ILO and FAO HQ Units</li> <li>• Consultations with stakeholders and beneficiaries of the project</li> <li>• Debriefing and presentation of preliminary findings in Zambia</li> </ul>	Evaluation team with logistical support by the Project	22 August – 1 <sup>st</sup> September (9 working days)
V	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elaboration of draft report</li> </ul>	Evaluation team	2-9 September (6 working days)
VI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft evaluation report submitted to Evaluation Manger for quality &amp; completeness review</li> </ul>	Evaluation team	9 September
VII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Circulate draft evaluation report to key stakeholders</li> <li>• Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to evaluation team leader</li> </ul>	Evaluation managers	Circulate 12 September Deadline for comments 26 September
VIII	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalize the report. Provide explanation on comments that were not included</li> </ul>	Evaluation team	27-30 September (3 working days)
IX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approval of report by EVAL</li> </ul>	EVAL	3- 4 October
X	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final report submitted to               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the donor through PARDEV</li> <li>○ Stakeholders through the ILO Lusaka</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Evaluation mangers	6 October

For this independent midterm evaluation, the final report preparation and submission procedure will be followed:

- The evaluation team leader will submit a draft evaluation report to the evaluation manager.

- The Evaluation Manager will carry out a rapid review to ensure quality and completeness of report and highlight any issue to be addressed by the evaluator if needed.
- The evaluation managers will then forward a copy to all other key stakeholders for comment and factual correction.
- The evaluation managers will consolidate the comments and send these to the evaluation team.
- The evaluation team will finalize the report incorporating any comments deemed appropriate and providing a comment matrix explaining how the comments were addressed and why any comments might not have been incorporated.
- The evaluation team leader will submit the final report and comment matrix to the evaluation managers.
- If questions or concerns remain about how comments were or were not addressed, the evaluation manager may request further explanation or response from the Evaluation Team Leader
- The evaluation manager officially forwards the approved evaluation report to PARDEV (who will submit the report officially to the donor) and other stakeholders as appropriate.

### **8. Key qualifications and experience of the Evaluation Team**

The **international consultant** should have the following qualifications:

- Master's degree in Business Management, Economics or related graduate qualifications
- A minimum of 10 years of professional experience specifically in evaluating international development initiatives in the area of skills, employment, micro enterprises, entrepreneurship, rural development and management of development programmes, preferably in Africa.
- Demonstrated expertise and capability in evaluating M4P projects. .
- Proven experience with result based program monitoring and evaluation approaches and other strategic planning approaches. Hands on skills for using M&E methods and approaches (including quantitative, qualitative and participatory), information analysis and report writing is essential.
- Consultant should demonstrate the clear understanding of Market system development approach particularly the M4P approach. S/he should have at least 5 years' experience of managing/advising/evaluating M4P projects.
- Consultant should have familiarity with the DCED standard for result measurement and ILOs result measurement and evaluation policies
- Knowledge and experience of the UN System.
- Understanding of the development context of the project country (Zambia) would be an added advantage.
- Excellent communication and interview skills.
- Excellent report writing skills.
- Demonstrated ability to deliver quality results within strict deadlines.

The **National consultant** should have the following qualifications:

- Master degree in Business Management, Economics or related graduate qualifications



- A minimum of 5 years of professional experience, specifically in the area of monitoring and evaluation of international development initiatives and development organizations.
- A minimum of 5 years of professional experience specifically in evaluating development projects/programmes in the area of Agriculture, food security, Decent job creation, youth employment, entrepreneurship, rural development and management of development programmes, preferably in Africa.
- Demonstrated expertise and capability in working with the private sector organizations particularly following the market system development approach.
- A track record of conducting various types of evaluations, including process, outcome and impact evaluations in Zambia and preferably in the area of Entrepreneurship, Youth empowerment and agriculture development
- Knowledge and experience of the UN System.
- Excellent communication and interview skills.
- Excellent report writing skills.

### **Expression of Interest**

Consultants are invited to submit an expression of interest to the Evaluation Manager (Mr. Gugsu Yimer Farice (farice@ilo.org)), by no later than 8<sup>th</sup> August 2016, by means of a CV, a detailed breakdown of the cost of the assignment and a note expressing previous experience and evaluations conducted which would be of relevance and added value to the assignment (no more than 3 pages). Submission of an example of a previous evaluation conducted will be off added value.

## Annex 2: Inception Report

### 1. INTRODUCTION

This concept report describes the key content and approach that this independent evaluation team aspires to follow. The members of this evaluation team are independent; they do not have any previous connection with or involvement in the YAPASA programme. The team consisting of Imran Sadruddin, Bangladesh and Ivan Stubbs, Zambia will conduct the evaluation; they will be supported and guided by Ben Haagsma, Fair & Sustainable Advisory Services (FSAS), the Netherlands. FSAS is the contractor of this MTE and the overall responsible party.

The ILO staff in Zambia will play a purely supportive character in the logistics and organization of this evaluation in the various districts and sites where the YAPASA programme is implemented. They will not participate in data collection and analysis.

### 2. ADHERENCE TO THE TOR

The key approach that the YAPASA programme has applied – **M4P and DCED** - also offers to the evaluators the key ingredients for the conceptual framework of this evaluation. The M4P emphasizes the systemic character of the two selected Value Chains and markets in which YAPASA operates and intends to achieve its outcomes. The evaluators underwrite this systemic character and will apply this in their data collection and analysis, assessing all possible factors affecting the success or lack of success of YAPASA for the intended target groups. The DCED standard is helpful for this assessment, because the evaluators will focus their attention to the assessment of the first step of the DCED standard, the articulation of the **Result Chains** in which the intermediate outcomes and outcomes are described in a logical order and sequence. In the case of YAPASA the evaluators will use the detailed result chains as presented in new intervention guides as the basis for their evaluation work.

The **scope** of the evaluation is **broad** as it covers both programme content, context and its operational and management dimensions; see the various evaluation questions. The scope is also **strategic** as it intends to briefly assess its fit within the broader sector policies of the GOZ and its match with other development programmes.

The MTE has a **qualitative** character aiming to provide **credible and reasonably validated** answers to the evaluation questions, using the different information sources that have been identified. The answers from these different information sources will be triangulated, also using an **iterative** way of working. If and when required specific answers from one information sources will be tested in a next interview or discussion to improve the understanding of the evaluators of the different comments and views that exist. This qualitative evaluation excludes the use of surveys for quantitative data collection from farming households and enterprises. But it will make use of assess the available **quantitative information** from the 2 selected value chains to illustrate the qualitative information on changes and results that have been obtained. It is evident that these quantitative information must be checked first on their reliability and relevance prior to its use in this MTE.

The evaluators will make use of the basic components of the **RBM framework** by focusing on **results** or **changes** as illustrated by the different outcome indicators. Thus far these outcome indicators have only been described in the revised logframe. The revised result chains in the new intervention guide will lay the foundation for the wider range of outcome indicators, but that has not yet occurred. The key attention of this evaluation is not on outputs, defined as the final products of the activities of the programme, but on the **use** dimension of these outputs by the intended target groups. The key question is: How well and for what purpose were these outputs used by the youth in their Value Chains? That question will also touch on the issue of **value for money**.

The different **DAC/OECD evaluation criteria** – relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact – will constitute the logical content of the evaluation attention on the changes achieved. The

evaluators will not look at efficiency by assessing the quality of annual work plans and budget spending, but will assess the demonstrated ability of the programme to monitor, evaluate and learn from the results it has achieved, and to constantly update and adjust its work plans and use of budget accordingly. That will also include the assessment of the unintended changes and how well they were assessed and incorporated in the programme implementation.

### 3. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will start with the **desk review** of all relevant documents. That will help the evaluators to understand the context and content of the programme, understanding which changes have already taken place in the course of implementation and which adjustments have been made. This desk review will provide extra information to sharpen and refine the interview questions.

The key process of data collection are the **interviews with open questions**, either administered to various selected key informants or to focus groups. In these open interviews the participants will be invited to share and voice their opinions on (lack of) progress of the programme including the underlying reasons. In order to achieve sufficient depth in their views and arguments, the **why question** will take a central position in these interviews and discussions. Interviewees will constantly be asked to explain the story and reasons behind this (lack of) progress and changes observed. Especially important with the M4P approach in mind is to critically discuss and assess the role and contribution (in terms of resources) that the interviewees themselves played in the achievement of these changes. Another key component of these interviews is the attribution dimension: assessing the causality between YAPASA activities and outputs to the outcomes and changes for the target groups.

**Data sources** will be multiple, illustrating the **diversity** of value chain actors within one value chain, whether as primary actors in the chain, as VC supporters (input suppliers, financial services) or as VC enablers (policy makers, government staff). The staff of ILO, FAO and SIDA are the complementary data sources.

**Sampling** of the interviewees will be based on this diversity, because that will assure the collection of the different views and interests that VC actors will have with respect to development and improvement of the value chains they are involved in. For the youth the sampling has been **stratified**, looking at young men and women in the value chains; possibly increasing this to farmers and laborers as separate categories. For the KII care is given to the best feasible representation of all relevant stakeholders in this evaluation to produce the most complete overview of all different views and roles.

**Field visits:** all relevant districts where the 2 VC are implemented will be visited. Site visits to the youth enterprises will take place to acquire on site impressions and observations, but the number of these visits will be limited because of the time constraints and long travel distances. Most youth groups will be interviewed at a more central location. The final choice and sampling is based on striking a balance between the available time and the necessary quality of findings.

**Interview formats** (for individual interviews and Focus Group Discussions) will reflect the evaluation questions and the 5 OECD criteria for evaluation. These interview questions will be used in a flexible manner, adjusting and refining them if and when necessary during the evaluation.

**Debrief workshop** has been planned at the end of the evaluation in Lusaka and it will be attended by the steering committee and other invited persons (to be decided by ILO). The objective of this workshop is to present the initial findings to this broad audience, receiving their feedback and comments. This debrief workshop has a dual objective of validation and adjustment of these initial findings and as a final data collection step. It will be the critical step before embarking on the reporting phase.

#### **4. WORK PLAN**

The work plan has been topic of the preparatory stage of the evaluation process. The proposed work plan has been commented on by the evaluators and consequently improved by YAPASA programme manager. The current work plan illustrates the scope and depth of the evaluation in terms of selected key stakeholders in both value chains, the geographical spread of project locations and the key implementation partners. A good balance has been struck between available man days for data collection, data analysis and reporting on the one hand, and the necessary quality of the evaluation on the other hand.

The time line also properly describes the two specific points in the process that the feedback and comments will be collected from ILO, FAO and other key stakeholders: 1) debrief workshop at the end of the data collection period in Zambia and 2) draft report.

The adapted work plan is integral part of the contract. It is also annexed to this inception report.

#### **5. ADHERENCE TO THE ILO GUIDANCE AND FORMATTING REQUIREMENTS**

The consultants acknowledge the different requirements for this evaluation, as identified in the writing format for this inception report. The hereunder mentioned requirements will be used as integral components of the final evaluation report:

- Formulation of recommendations
- Identification and presentation of lessons learnt
- Identification and presentation of emerging good practices

The ILO YAPASA manager has provided the evaluators with key project documents and reports, all put into one dropbox. This dropbox has been constantly updated on the request of the evaluators. The dropbox contains project documents, ILO policy documents and ILO evaluation guidance notes and checklists for the inception and final report.

### Annex 3: List of Persons Interviewed

Meetings Were Held with the Following for the YAPASA Mid Term Review					
District	Institution	Contact person	Position	Contact Number	Email Address
Lusaka	International Labour Organization	Mr. Alexio Musindo	Director	+26021252701	<a href="mailto:musindo@ilo.org">musindo@ilo.org</a>
Lusaka	YAPASA-ILO/FAO	Mr Steve Morris	CTA-Team leader	+260967762641	<a href="mailto:morriss@ilo.org">morriss@ilo.org</a>
Lusaka	SIDA	Mr Zoole Newa	NPO-YAPASA focal point	+260967411844	<a href="mailto:zoole.newa@gov.se">zoole.newa@gov.se</a>
Lusaka	Department of Fisheries	Mr Patrick Ngalande	Director	+260977887300	
Chongwe	Palabana fisheries	Sammy Willey	Director	+260977822030	<a href="mailto:sammywilley@yahoo.com">sammywilley@yahoo.com</a>
	Palabana Fisheries Youth Group in Kanakantapa				-
Lusaka	ADAZ	Mr Fisho Mwale	Chairman	+260979335201	<a href="mailto:fishomwale@gmail.com">fishomwale@gmail.com</a>
Kasama	Wind of Change	Mr Joesph Mutale	Director	+260979780522	<a href="mailto:mutalejoseph10@yahoo.com">mutalejoseph10@yahoo.com</a>
	Wind of Change Outgrower farmers				-
Kasama	Regitech	Mr Daniel Bwalya	Director	+260954411384	<a href="mailto:danielbwalya@gmail.com">danielbwalya@gmail.com</a>
Kasama	JEDO	Mr Jenkins Kapeya	Director	+260965252130	<a href="mailto:jedocommodities@gmail.com">jedocommodities@gmail.com</a>
Kasama	Musika	Victor Chisi	Regional manager	+260977871575	
Kabwe	Makombe farms	Mr Viachi Mokombe	Director	+260967052777	<a href="mailto:makombe2011@gmail.com">makombe2011@gmail.com</a>
Chibombo	Victor Series Production	Mr Joseph Mushalika	Director	+260977894045	<a href="mailto:jmushalika@yahoo.com">jmushalika@yahoo.com</a>
	Chibombo Victor Series Outgrower Group				-

Lusaka	Ministry of Youth Sport and Child Development	Mr Kennedy Mukupa	Assistant Director	+260979960054	<a href="mailto:mumamukupa@gmail.com">mumamukupa@gmail.com</a>
Lusaka	Ministry of Agriculture	Mr Shadreck Mwale	Principal Agricultural officer	+260977497563	<a href="mailto:shadreckmwale@gmail.com">shadreckmwale@gmail.com</a>
Lusaka	PayITAPP	Mr Joseph Lubinda	Director	+260977515058	joseph@payitapp.co
Lusaka	Syngenta-MRI	Mr Mark Stokes	Head of Customer Marketing	+260968772456	<a href="mailto:mark.stokes@syngenta.com">mark.stokes@syngenta.com</a>
Kasama	Vision Fund Zambia	Mr. Kapi Muuwa	Branch Manager	M +260965047806	<a href="mailto:kapi_masuwa@visionfundzambia.org">kapi_masuwa@visionfundzambia.org</a>

## Annex 4: Data Collection Instruments

### Question guide format for VC actors and/or stakeholders

	QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
1	Introduction	
2	Their involvement in the YAPASA programme; the role they played; and their appreciation of that role	
3	Appreciation of the YAPASA programme and its key M4P approach; strengths and weaknesses of programme as a whole and key components (activities, approach); changes that occurred in the course of implementation	
4	Check on other similar programmes in the YAPASA intervention area; appreciative comparison between YAPASA and these other programmes.	
5	Key changes that occurred since start of YAPASA programme and farms & households, and private sector enterprises directly engaged:	
6	- Farm performance and household food security; yield levels, access to and use of quality inputs, key farming practices; profitability (C/B ratio)	
7	- Business performance of private actors in the primary value chain; profitability, number of clients, volume, employment creation	
8	- Market performance and Value Chain relations	
9	- Business and/or policy environment; government policies and regulations	
10	- Access to key services: finance, inputs, research, information	
11	Attribution dimension: to what extent YAPASA caused and contributed to these changes	
12	PS initiatives and own contributions & investments in the VC	
13	Examples of crowding in by other VC actors and copying by other farmers not directly targeted by YAPASA	

14	Unintended changes and necessary management decisions	
15	Indications of Impact; sustainability of these changes	
16	Key challenges and opportunities	
	<b>For ILO and FAO staff</b> Same questions, plus extra	
17	Skills and resources used for implementation; who played which role; complementarity between ILO and FAO	
18	Adjustments of result chains or intervention guides; lessons learnt leading to adjustments	
19	Quality of M&E systems: data gathering, data analysis, decision making and feedback (reporting)	
20	Integration of M&E – including reviewing and learning- into meetings, work plans and budgets	
21	Relevancy of External support; contribution to internal capacity building	

### Observations

- 1) All questions have to be formulated as **open** questions inviting persons to provide their honest and best answers and stories; where necessary probing for the real reasons behind their answers and validating their answers.
- 2) The interview guidelines that I annexed are especially useful to share with the facilitator for the FGD discussions
- 3) Appreciation of the respondents is always about what they think what went well and why; and what went less well and why? Or about strengths and weaknesses (challenges).
- 4) The 'WHY' question is therefore the crucial probing question, asking for examples, further explanation
- 5) Interviews can be closed by giving opportunity to them for providing any final comment or asking questions.